



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2025

No. 152

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WITTMAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 17, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT J. WITTMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2025, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

(Mr. KENNEDY of New York was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Preparedness Month because when disaster strikes, preparedness is not optional. It is essential.

Since 2004, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has led a national preparedness campaign to improve emergency readiness. From building supply kits to organizing volunteer ef-

orts to raising awareness about emergency alert systems, National Preparedness Month is a reminder that communities can reduce and, in some cases, prevent devastation.

Disasters don't wait for election cycles or budget negotiations. Floods, fires, blizzards, hurricanes, and tornadoes arrive suddenly, shattering lives and testing our Nation's resiliency.

When these moments arrive, FEMA must be ready to act as the lifeline that millions of Americans depend on, especially as these events are becoming more frequent, destructive, and unpredictable.

Last year alone, the United States experienced 27 disasters, costing more than \$1 billion: wildfires in the West, flooding in the South, hurricanes along our coasts, tornadoes in the heartland, and blizzards in the North.

As the ranking member of the Emergency Management and Technology Subcommittee, I have seen firsthand the importance of FEMA's work and the pressing need to safeguard its mission.

This National Preparedness Month, the stakes are much higher. At the very moment when Americans need strong, stable leadership in Federal emergency management, some in this Chamber and in the White House are pushing to undermine it.

Let me be clear: Eliminating FEMA, cutting preparedness grants, or hollowing out the Agency's workforce is not just reckless. It is playing politics with people's lives. It leaves families stranded, communities overwhelmed, and local responders without the Federal support they desperately need.

Preparedness begins locally, with families making plans, schools running emergency drills, local and State leaders building resilient infrastructure, and emergency managers issuing alerts for dangerous conditions, but no city, county, or State can manage the full scale of today's disasters alone.

That is why FEMA exists. It is the backbone of our Nation's disaster readiness and a bridge to recovery.

Now is the time to strengthen FEMA, not to dismantle it. FEMA brings the surge capacity, coordination, and resources that no municipality can summon alone. From housing assistance and debris removal to hazard mitigation and long-term rebuilding, FEMA is the connective tissue of our national preparedness.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to ensure our constituents and the communities we represent never have to wonder whether their Federal Government will be there to support them when disaster strikes.

Disasters do not discriminate between red States and blue States. Preparedness is not partisan. It is a shared responsibility and moral obligation.

This National Preparedness Month, we owe it to every family, first responder, and community to ensure FEMA stands ready to help, respond, recover, and rebuild.

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CAUCUS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as the co-chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am proud to be an advocate for CTE and the work we do to support job training, apprenticeships, and CTE programs.

Skills-based education provides learners of all ages with career-ready skills, giving individuals the tools to succeed and restoring the rungs on the ladder of opportunity.

From agriculture to the arts and from marketing to manufacturing,

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4367

CTE programs work to develop America's most valuable resource: its people. A highly skilled workforce is important to the success of our American economy.

That is why, together with the CTE Caucus co-chair, Congresswoman BONAMICI, I introduced two bills that increase career counseling for students and adult learners.

The Counseling for Career Choice Act would expand K-12 career counseling services and provide more resources focused on financial literacy, registered apprenticeships, dual enrollment programs, internships, and even financing for college or other postsecondary education.

Career counseling gives students the tools that they need to make well-informed decisions about their futures. When we equip school counselors with the resources necessary, we can help close our Nation's skills gap and let students find the pathway to fulfilling careers.

The Counseling for Career Choice Act ensures that middle and high school students are made fully aware of their career and educational options prior to graduation so that they are aware of all the opportunities before them.

CTE has established itself as a path that many high-achieving students choose in pursuit of industry certifications and hands-on skills that they can use right out of high school in skills-based education programs or college.

For adult learners, we introduced the Creating Opportunities to Thrive and Advance Act, or COTA Act for short, to help spread the word about career counseling through public outreach.

COTA amends title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, or WIOA, to bolster career guidance for adults.

For the first time, this bill would allow for public outreach such as public service announcements, social media campaigns, job fairs, and other means to educate the public on workforce development programs.

Mr. Speaker, we must be able to tell the public about the resources available to them. Increasing access to career opportunities is a good investment, and the COTA Act will give individuals the resources they need to take the next step in their careers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both bills and to join the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus today.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LLOYD WILLIAMS

(Mr. ESPAILLAT of New York was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a good friend, Lloyd Williams, president and CEO of The Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce and cofounder of HARLEM WEEK.

Lloyd was a dear friend and beloved member of the Harlem community. Through his lifetime of public service, spanning more than 50 years, more than one-half century, Lloyd was dedicated in his unparalleled dedication to fostering economic empowerment, cultural pride, and social equity in the village of Harlem.

□ 1010

Born on January 16, 1945, in Jamaica and immigrated to New York City at the age of 2, where he was raised in Harlem, Lloyd committed a lifetime of service to the advancement and empowerment of the Harlem community. In many ways, Lloyd Williams was Mr. Harlem.

He earned his higher education degree at The City College of New York and developed a lifelong passion for civic engagement, economic development, and cultural preservation.

In 1974, Lloyd Williams, along with Manhattan Borough President Percy E. Sutton, Voza Rivers, and others, co-founded Harlem Week, which was initially designated as a 1-day event to restore community pride, yet it grew into a multi-week cultural festival celebrating Harlem's history, art, music, business, and contributions to society, attracting millions of people annually.

In 1988, Lloyd was appointed president of the Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce, becoming one of the longest serving leaders of this important organization, guiding the Chamber through periods of economic challenges and revitalization over more than four decades.

Under his visionary leadership, the Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce expanded its mission to promote minority-owned businesses, attract investment, foster entrepreneurship, and support workforce development initiatives that improve economic opportunities for Harlem's residents.

Lloyd championed key social issues, including affordable housing, education reform, health equity, climate change awareness, and bridging the digital divide, working tirelessly to ensure that Harlem's growth was inclusive and reflective of the need of its diverse population.

Lloyd was a champion of Harlem's cultural institutions and heritage and served as a dedicated mentor, friend, and adviser to many others throughout New York City.

We are all saddened by his passing and will miss him greatly, but we will always and forever remember him and his enduring commitment to civil rights, social justice, and community advocacy.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, Lloyd Williams was my friend. In the political terrain, I believe that he paid for our friendship, but he never backed down. His last message to me, a text message, simply said: Proud.

Well, we are all proud of Lloyd Williams. We will never forget him. His

impact and influence will be remembered across Harlem USA and across the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING JEFF WILSON

(Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly great South Carolinian, Mr. Jeff Wilson. He is an outstanding public servant and beacon of our farming community. As head of Cotton Hills Farm in Lowrys, South Carolina, he recently was named the South Carolina Farmer of the Year for 2025 by the Sunbelt Ag Expo. This distinct honor is for his decades of dedicated service to farming, conservation, and community.

For over 40 years, Jeff Wilson has exemplified the very best of what it means to be a South Carolina farmer. He is hardworking, he is innovative, and he is deeply committed to preserving the land and the legacy of his family.

Cotton Hills Farm has been in the Wilson family since 1882. That is over 143 years ago. Originally starting with only 100 acres gifted to Jeff by his great-grandmother, it now spans over 1,000 acres producing a diverse array of crops.

Jeff's story is one of dedication not only to the land but to the family. After serving our Nation in the Air Force during the Vietnam war, Jeff returned home to carry on the farm. He followed in the footsteps of his father, who took over the farm at the age of 13. Now, four generations later, Jeff farms alongside his sons, Jeb and Pete.

Jeff has truly been an innovator in the agriculture industry. He has upheld sustainable farming practices long before they were commonplace and adopted no-till methods, cover cropping, and efficient underground irrigation to conserve water and to protect the soil. His commitment to conservation has earned him statewide and national recognition, including leadership roles on the soil and water conservation state board and the Southeast Region Hall of Fame award for the National Association of Conservation Districts.

Jeff also works outside the family farm. He and his family operate three retail markets and a GAP-certified packing facility. These bring the fresh, local produce directly to the consumers.

Throughout his life, Jeff has been deeply involved in serving his community. He has served 50 years with the Ruritan Club, 30 years with the Young Farmer and Agribusiness Association, and he is on the Clemson Extension Advisory Committee. He was also awarded County Conservationist of the Year.

Jeff's commitment to education through programs like the annual Farm & Tractor Day and the South Carolina Ag + Art Tour reflect his desire to share the values of agriculture with future generations.

Above all, Jeff Wilson's character stands as a shining example of integrity and of gratitude. His faith in our Almighty God and his humility are shown in everything he does, always reminding us of how important it is to give back to our community and to our country.

I can personally attest to the genuine and forward-thinking spirit that Jeff brings to every opportunity. His leadership strengthens South Carolina agriculture, ensures the future of family farming, and honors the heritage that makes our State proud.

On behalf of the people of South Carolina, I thank Mr. Jeff Wilson for his extraordinary contributions to our State, to our city, to our county, and to our country. I pray this work continues to inspire young people to lead by his strong values.

We just had the tragic passing of a great American, Charlie Kirk, who extolled the values of faith, family, and freedom. Jeff Wilson extolls the values that Mr. Kirk extolled for 31 years of his life.

Godspeed.

PARTNERSHIP FOR L.A. SCHOOLS

(Mr. HOYER of Maryland was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and critical responsibilities any nation has, any community has, any State has, is the education of its children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the extraordinary work of an organization from Los Angeles that has lessons for every community in America.

Nearly two decades ago, then-Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa partnered with my good friends, philanthropists Melanie and Richard Lundquist, to launch the Partnership for Los Angeles Schools. Dr. Lundquist is with us today.

Their nonprofit is committed to strengthening public schools in some of L.A.'s most underserved and challenging communities.

Today, under the leadership of Guadalupe Guerrero, the Partnership for L.A. Schools manages 20 K-12 public schools, serving more than 13,500 students in Boyle Heights, Watts, and South L.A.

These are not charter schools. They are neighborhood public schools working in close collaboration with the Los Angeles Unified School District.

The results speak for themselves.

When the partnership began, the high school graduation rate in its schools was just 36 percent. Today, that rate has risen to 92 percent.

The progress does not stop there. This year's partnership schools reached their highest math performance ever and matched their strongest literary results.

□ 1020

Following the pandemic, students demonstrated 3 consecutive years of

growth in math and 2 consecutive years of growth in reading.

Every partnership elementary school advanced in literacy, and nearly all of them advanced in math, as well. Black and emergent bilingual students, those who have historically faced the steepest barriers, made some of the strongest gains.

I had the opportunity to see this outstanding education model at work when I toured Santee High School, one of the partnership's campuses. I was impressed by the students and their learning progress. I was convinced then and am even more certain now that the partnership has created a scalable and sustainable model for schools nationally.

The partnership is not only a success for L.A. but an example for all of America. Their work demonstrates that when we invest in teacher coaching, leadership development, aligned systems of support, and other proven strategies, students make real and, importantly, lasting gains.

Many in our country have taken aim at public schools recently. The partnership is proof that our public schools can deliver for every child so long as we provide them with the right tools and, importantly, the resources. The partnership continues to prove that every day.

I commend the Partnership for L.A. Schools—its educators, students, and families—for showing our country a better path forward.

Dr. Lundquist has become a dear friend and an extraordinary shining example for us all. I recognize my friend, Melanie, who is with me here today, and the tens of thousands of children, teachers, and participants who have made this such a success.

Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of children have seen brighter futures because of Melanie and her husband Richard's philanthropy, vision, and dedication to improving America's public schools.

My friend, the late congressman Bill Natcher, used to say: "As long as you take care of the health of your people and the education of your children, you'll continue to live in the strongest and best nation on earth."

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what Melanie Lundquist and the partnership for LA Schools are doing.

And for that, they have my thanks and the gratitude of the American people.

RECOGNIZING THE SUAREZ-DELGADO FAMILY

(Mr. BACON of Nebraska was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Suarez-Delgado family from my district for Hispanic Heritage Month. Their story is one of resilience, devotion, and the pursuit of opportunity, one that reminds us of the enduring promise of the American Dream.

Father Jaime Suarez-Reyes, born in Mexico, visited Disneyland as a child,

and it lit a spark in his heart. He decided then and there that America would be his home. In 1981, he began raising a family with his wife, Patricia Delgado de Suarez, and set his dream in motion.

The path was anything but easy. The process of immigrating took 7 years of perseverance, paperwork, and determination. In 1990, Jaime was able to bring Patricia and their four children, Jaime Jr., Adrian, Lorena, and Paulina, to Omaha, Nebraska.

Life in America demanded courage and adjustment. The Suarez children entered school, learning English and embracing the culture of their new home. With the support of kind neighbors and welcoming friends, the family grew in confidence and faith in the promise of freedom and opportunity.

Jaime worked tirelessly to support his family. His early jobs included shifts in a meatpacking plant, cleaning offices, and selling cars at H&H Ford. As his English improved, new doors opened. He became a Realtor, an insurance agent, and a banker. Yet, his true calling was entrepreneurship.

Jaime ventured into the restaurant business and steadily expanded into other enterprises, building a foundation of a legacy that his children will carry forward.

Jaime's success was never about business. It was about service. Together with Patricia, he served Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, teaching pre-marriage classes. In 1995, they became ordained family life ministers.

Jaime volunteered in Millard Public Schools as a translator, mentor, and soccer coach. He helped Hispanic students attend national leadership conferences, ensuring that opportunity extended beyond his own family and to a broader community.

From Jaime's example of faith and sacrifice, the Suarez children forged remarkable paths of their own.

Son Jaime Jr., a Creighton Prep and UNO alumnus, stayed in Omaha to continue the family's entrepreneurial tradition. Today, he operates 13 restaurants and co-founded real estate development and construction companies with his brother Adrian. He serves on nonprofit boards, to include OneWorld Community Health. He has been appointed to the Nebraska Latino Commission and the Omaha Landmarks Heritage Preservation Commission.

His brother Adrian also remained in Omaha. A graduate of Creighton Prep and Creighton University, Adrian currently runs the family business, managing more than 100 employees. He has served on the board of trustees of the Omaha Public Library.

Their sister Lorena, a graduate of Marian High School, the University of Rochester, and UNMC, became a surgeon specializing in oncology. Today, she serves as a faculty member at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Finally, Paulina chose a career in nursing. Now a registered nurse in Warren, Ohio, she and her husband run

□ 1030

two gyms and manage an office building that supports nonprofits.

The story of the Suarez-Delgado family reflects the best of the American spirit. From humble beginnings to professional achievements, their legacy is one of faith, family, and community. It is proof that the American Dream is alive, that it endures, and that the American Dream can be fulfilled through generations to come through resilience, devotion, hard work, a love of family, and faith.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Suarez-Delgado family for pursuing their American Dream.

RESPECT FOR SCIENCE AND PURSUIT OF TRUTH

(Ms. JOHNSON of Texas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a topic that should transcend partisanship: respect for science and the pursuit of truth.

History shows us that when nations embrace science, they grow stronger. When they suppress it, they grow weaker and often less free.

Throughout our history, we have witnessed dictators and authoritarian leaders suppress science and knowledge because it threatened their rule.

In Nazi Germany, Jewish scientists were forced out of universities, and research was put under complete control of the government. The result was not only the loss of a generation of brilliant minds but a society in which truth itself was subjugated to government propaganda.

In Stalin's Soviet Union, biology was condemned as "bourgeois science." Researchers who insisted on facts rather than ideology were imprisoned, killed, or sent to work in slave labor.

Even as far back as Mao's Cultural Revolution, China dismantled academic institutions, silenced experts, and elevated loyalty over knowledge. Generations lost their chance at education, and the nation's progress was stunted.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not learn from our history, we are doomed to repeat it. We are witnessing the same pattern repeating in our own lifetime.

In Hungary, Viktor Orban has taken over universities, closed independent institutions, and forced academic programs to shut down when they contradict his political goals.

In Russia, Vladimir Putin has jailed scientists and censored research, all to preserve the illusion of control and strength.

What these regimes have in common is simple: They know that science, at its core, is a challenge to authoritarianism. Science is a search for truth. It cannot be dictated by politicians, so when science becomes an affront to the goals of authoritarian leaders, they attack it, suppress it, deny it, and replace it with propaganda and misinformation.

Here at home, Donald Trump is following the same playbook. He has mocked climate scientists, dismissed decades of evidence, even as Americans suffer record floods, droughts, and wildfires.

Donald Trump has undermined doctors and public health officials by putting the Nation's leading vaccine denier in charge of our public health. Trump has promoted unproven cures for diseases, cut billions in critical research funding, and dismantled advisory boards that create avenues for government to work with scientists to make good policy.

In his 2026 budget, Trump is proposing to eliminate funding for the Administration for Community Living, which supports older and disabled Americans; the Department of Health and Human Services' Prevention and Public Health Fund; the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Trust Fund; the Pediatric Brain Tumor Consortium, an association of 16 academic centers and children's hospitals dedicated to trials of novel treatments for pediatric brain cancer; and so much more.

We need to understand why this is happening and why Republicans in this Congress are supporting it. These attacks are not random. They are deliberate, and they prove a tendency by this President to emulate the authoritarians of the past and present.

Trump's goal is to erode trust in experts, replace facts with loyalty, and convince Americans that only one man and one government can be trusted to define what is right and what is wrong. When a leader can erase truth and rewrite reality, they can justify anything. They can jail opponents. They can seize power and ignore the judges and the rule of law. They undermine the very essence of democracy itself.

Mr. Speaker, science is not partisan. It is not our political enemy. It is a safeguard against lies and misinformation. When our Nation's top leaders attack it, they are not only rejecting evidence. They are rejecting accountability.

America has always been strongest when we embrace discovery and not denial. When we put researchers, innovators, and problem-solvers to work—from curing polio to sending humans to the Moon and leading breakthroughs in clean energy and technology—our greatness has always come from empowering science, not mocking it.

Trump and Republicans are working to gut these critical advancements. Their tactics echo the worst chapters of history, and they mirror the tactics of authoritarian regimes today. If we fail to call this out, we risk normalizing it.

I believe the American people know what is at stake. They know that progress, safety, and freedom depend on science and truth, and truth cannot be dictated from a bully pulpit.

Defending science means defending democracy. It is about making sure our children inherit a nation that values evidence over propaganda and freedom over fear.

We cannot let authoritarians' attack on truth take root here. We cannot let science become the casualty of politics because if we do, history shows us exactly where that road will lead.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CHARLIE KIRK

(Mr. McGUIRE of Virginia was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Charlie Kirk. The country is heartbroken. As everyone knows, Charlie Kirk was assassinated last week for his beliefs of faith, family, and freedom.

Words are not violence. Violence is violence, and based on a pattern from the radical left, the message is clear: Keep your different points of view to yourself or else. That is an attack on the most important founding principle of our country and that is our First Amendment freedom of speech.

We must stay strong. We must keep fighting to keep our conservative principles, our Christian principles, strong.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie Kirk was a devoted father and husband and a Christian who deeply loved our Nation. His amazing wife, Erika, has lost a husband, and two beautiful children will have to grow up without the guidance of their father. When asked how he would want to be remembered if he passed away, he said: I want to be remembered for my faith. That should be the most important thing.

Those celebrating his assassination and lying about his record, well, that is just disappointing and that is wrong.

Charlie believed civil dialogue could always prevail, standing for civil discourse over violence. His debate skills were second to none and he captured the hearts and minds of all Americans, especially young Americans across our country.

He courageously pushed back against radical leftist divisive ideologies that have eroded our national unity. Unfortunately, some in the media continue to misconstrue his message to be of hate, but he treated all human beings with dignity and respect.

Charlie's legacy on the world left a message that resonates with an entire generation, and it is only getting stronger. He was a devoted servant of our Savior Jesus Christ and it is best to live his teachings every day.

Later this week, I hope everyone in the House will join me in supporting the resolution honoring the life of Charlie Kirk. Charlie lived with courage, compassion, and conviction. He was a fierce defender of the American founding principles, such as limited government, individual responsibility,

life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Since Charlie founded Turning Point USA in 2012, when he was 18 years old in his garage, he became and remained a prominent voice in our political discourse.

He was the strongest defender of our First Amendment. He worked tirelessly to promote unity without compromising his convictions.

Mr. Speaker, my message to all Americans is, we live in a dangerous world. Stay vigilant and let us keep an eye on each other. If you see something, say something, do something. Charlie's death is tragic and sober, but I can already see God is turning this tragedy into a greater good. Charlie will be laid to rest this Sunday in Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, from a grateful nation, we thank Charlie for all he has done. May he rest in peace.

Well done good and faithful servant, Matthew 25:21.

REMEMBERING JARED KNEALE

(Mrs. SYKES of Ohio was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to speak out on an important issue impacting this Nation and my community in Ohio.

As you may know, September is Suicide Prevention Month, a time to pause and recognize mental health and the tragedy of taking one's own life.

Today, I rise with both a heavy heart and a hopeful spirit, because while my community has felt the devastating toll of suicide, I also believe in the power of advocacy and awareness in order to save lives.

Suicide Prevention Month is an opportunity for us to reflect and discuss stigmas around mental health and affirm, once again, that mental health care is healthcare.

Today, I will specifically address the sacrifices of our police officers, firefighters, paramedics, and other first responders. These are the women and men running toward danger while others flee for safety.

At the end of the day, after news stories publish details of their heroism, the weight of the trauma may linger long after sirens fade.

In 2021, the CDC acknowledged that law enforcement officers and firefighters are more likely to die by suicide than in the line of duty.

Jared Kneale is one such story from northeast Ohio. Born on October 5, 1981, in Euclid, Ohio, Jared graduated from Wadsworth High School in the year 2000. After working for the city of Wadsworth as a fireman and paramedic for 15 years, Jared transferred to the nearby city of Canton, Ohio, in Ohio's 13th Congressional District where he would serve his community for 8 years.

On Friday, May 17, 2024, northeast Ohio and Ohio's 13th District lost a dutiful public servant and a loving husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

The Canton Fire Department would later announce in a post on social media that Kneale's death was the result of a suicide due to a post-traumatic stress-related illness and that in his final moments, Jared signaled to us his wishes to use his death to help bring awareness to firefighter mental health. That is why I stand today before you, Mr. Speaker, to do exactly that and carry out Jared's last wishes.

Mr. Speaker, far too many suffer in silence, afraid of judgment or showing signs of weakness, but it is time we stand up for those who run toward danger, that we acknowledge our collective strength far surpasses the individual, and that asking for help is truly the greatest form of strength.

Rarely have I seen a better example of this than in the immediate aftermath of Jared's passing. Upon hearing about the tragedy, over 70 firefighters descended upon the local hospital to pay their respects.

As my community continues to grieve, cases like Jared's cannot be ignored because when we invest in mental health, we invest in all of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a moment to talk a little bit about Jared and his life and the person that he was.

Jared, who worked with the 2nd Battalion and was assigned to ladder truck one, was loved by his colleagues. During his tenure with the city of Canton, he earned two Medals of Commendation and two meritorious citations for heroic actions on the job.

He was the head chef at station one and took great pride in sharing meals with his colleagues. Jared was known for his infectious laughter and he was the ringleader of the pranks at the station.

He also had a love for peanut butter M&Ms and Chewy SweeTARTS, always making sure his candy was stocked, knowing full well the rest of his crew would sneak handfuls out of his locker.

Jared was a devoted husband to his wife, Carrie, and a loving father to his six children: Tim, Shaunna, Caden, Aidan, Olivia, and Isabella. He was a fan of the Cleveland Browns, loved riding his Harley, and was a talented carpenter and mechanic. Behind every uniform is a person just like Jared who feels, grieves, and may struggle to cope with the toll of the demands of their work.

According to the National Firefighters Association, 20 percent of firefighters and paramedics meet the criteria for post-traumatic stress at some point during their careers. Additionally, the suicide rate for firefighters is much higher for them than the general public. The connection between PTSD and traumatic rescue work is quite clear. We, as a legislative body, must do more to ensure that first responders never have to carry this burden alone. We also, as human beings, must do more to be there for one another.

In the wake of Jared's passing, the Canton Fire Department said: "We

urge our fellow brothers and sisters to reach out to one another." We must remember that we have more in common than we do that separates us. We must do more to reach out and care for our neighbors who are struggling.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that everyone knows that if you are struggling, if you know someone who is struggling, you can call or text 9-8-8 for personalized support during these difficult times. They are not alone.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I thank Jared's family for allowing me to share his story and uplift a firefighter and someone who is so very important to our community but lost their life tragically.

□ 1040

WE ARE BETTER TOGETHER

(Mr. MANN of Kansas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today still in shock and saddened at the political assassination of Charlie Kirk. There is no place for political violence in our country, and it is antithetical to who we are as Americans.

The beauty of our Nation and the First Amendment is that anyone from anywhere has the right to express their beliefs, engage in dialogue, and disagree peacefully. That is the heart of our democracy. We need to get back to embracing that dialogue.

Charlie often said that when we stop talking, that is when violence happens. I don't want to live in a society where we don't talk to people we disagree with and resort to violence. Leadership is never easy, but it falls on us to lead the way by carrying on the mission that Charlie lived for of open debate in a free society in the greatest nation that the world has ever known.

When al-Qaida terrorists attacked our Nation 24 years ago, they had one goal—to destroy America. They didn't see us as Democrats or Republicans, red States or blue States. They just saw Americans, one nation under God, and their goal was to destroy us. When we lose sight of seeing the humanity in our fellow Americans who think differently than us and convince ourselves they are the enemy instead of our neighbor, we are feeding into the very thing our adversaries want, and destroy our great country from within. We are better than this.

America is the greatest country in the world. All 340 million of us have different perspectives, values, and beliefs. I can't count how many issues I disagree with my colleagues across the aisle on, yet we know we can disagree without turning to violence. Charlie Kirk was an example of this. He did things the right way, having healthy debates with people who saw differently than him and sparking a movement that transformed an entire generation. Charlie believed in the promise of America, and his life's work

was making sure we lived up to that promise.

Audrey and I continue to pray for Charlie's wife, Erika, who has two beautiful young children, and his family, friends, and supporters. Last week, President Trump invited the Nation to commit to praying for the country for 1 hour a week ahead of our 250th birthday. I would encourage us to accept that challenge. It is hard to hate someone when you pray with them and for them regularly.

One of the greatest blessings of this job is that I get to know and spend time with Kansans all across the Big First District, and because of that, I know that we are better than this. America is still the greatest country in the world, and I am hopeful that we will all take the opportunity to follow Charlie's example by engaging on the issues with our neighbors and living up to the promise of our great country.

RETURN TO REGULAR ORDER

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt stands at \$37 trillion. For years, elected officials from both sides of the aisle have come to Washington ringing the alarm on our national debt, and rightly so. The only problem is, often they get to the Nation's Capital, and there is little to no appetite to make hard decisions to get our spending in check.

At the start of President Trump's historic second term earlier this year, he did the unthinkable. He paused Federal spending, went line by line through the Federal budget, and seriously evaluated how we are spending our tax dollars. For some people in this town, it was heartburn. However, Mr. Speaker, Kansans in the Big First District welcomed this fiscal sanity.

The reality is, our national debt is unsustainable. If every single household was to contribute and bring our debt to zero, we would each be responsible for \$289,000. Consider that the average mortgage in America is about \$245,000. No one in this body would allow a loved one to make continuously poor financial decisions like this. Why do we do it with our government?

House Republicans have been clear that we would like to return to regular order, pass 12 individual appropriations bills, and get our spending under control. Despite this reality, the consensus among too many in Washington is that they would rather see President Trump fail than work together to fund the government responsibly. It is frustrating, and rather than coming to the table to work together, they prefer to grandstand to try to score some political points.

We are better than this, Mr. Speaker. I urge my Democratic colleagues to come to the table, return to regular order, and let's get our fiscal house back in order.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING AND HEALTHCARE

(Mr. MAGAZINER of Rhode Island was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, it was just announced this week that health insurance costs in Rhode Island are going to go up by as much as 22 percent next year, costing working people thousands of dollars more per year to pay for their health insurance. This is money that people don't have. Most people in my State, most people in this country are just barely getting by. They can't afford to pay thousands of dollars more for their health insurance.

It is not just in Rhode Island that it is happening. It is all across the country. State after State is announcing next year's insurance rates with double digit increases. We know why this is happening. It is happening because Republicans and the Trump administration just cut a trillion dollars from Medicaid, and now they are also trying to let the Affordable Care Act tax premiums expire.

When you do that, when you take trillions of dollars out of the healthcare system, you are not just taking away health insurance coverage from millions of Americans, you are also taking revenue away from hospitals, community health centers, and doctors' practices. The only way that those healthcare providers can stay in business is to raise prices on everybody else, and that is exactly what is happening.

We told our Republican colleagues that this is what would happen when they passed that trillion dollar cut to Medicaid. We told them that health insurance costs were going to go up for everybody else in the country, but they didn't want to hear it. They were so desperate to give away tax cuts to the rich, and now those people watching at home are going to be paying the bill in the form of higher healthcare costs.

However, it is not too late. We can still restore funding for healthcare so that everyone back home isn't hit by double-digit cost increases on their insurance.

Congress is about to pass a budget for next year, and we can pass a budget that restores funding for healthcare, that extends the Affordable Care Act tax premiums, that restores funding for Medicaid so that working people aren't stuck with higher costs for their health insurance. Not only can we do this, we must.

I want to vote for a bipartisan budget that funds the government and protects healthcare for the American people, but if, as has been advertised, the Republican majority tries to rush a vote on a budget that does not fix the healthcare crisis, the healthcare crisis that they created, then I will be a "no." All of my colleagues should be, as well.

Republicans control the House, Senate, and the White House. If they refuse to pass a budget that protects

healthcare, they own the consequences. If they choose to shut the government down instead of fixing the healthcare crisis that they created, the American people will not forgive them.

RESTORING LIFESAVING FOOD AID

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the 41st time to call on the Trump administration to restore lifesaving food aid for children starving around the world. Edesia Nutrition in my district is about to send 15,000 boxes of this lifesaving food aid to children who are starving in Gaza.

Now, in the past, this would have been done with support from America, from the U.S. taxpayers, and the boxes shipped to Gaza would have said "from the American people." However, because the Trump administration has cut off lifesaving food aid for children, instead this shipment is being funded by the Israelis and nonprofit organizations working with Edesia Nutrition.

This is a missed opportunity for America to be building goodwill in a very unstable part of the world, one of many missed opportunities because when we act to save the lives of starving children around the world, we are not just doing the right thing morally, we are helping make America stronger by building goodwill around the world.

The Trump administration has promised repeatedly that they are going to restore this program, but promises do not save the lives of starving kids. Only nutrition can do that.

I will continue to speak on this floor every day until the Trump administration honors its word and restores this program.

HEALTHCARE SUBSIDIES AND RESCISSIONS

(Mr. OLSZEWSKI of Maryland was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. OLSZEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks 257 consecutive days that this Congress has failed to take meaningful action to address the cost-of-living crisis weighing heavily on struggling American families.

Regrettably, the President and Republican leadership have made life more difficult and less affordable for hardworking families across our Nation through chaotic trade policies and devastating cuts to healthcare and food programs.

□ 1050

The pending expiration of health insurance subsidies at the close of this year, in particular, threatens to impose a severe and unwarranted tax hike on the middle class.

Allowing these subsidies to lapse will cause out-of-pocket premiums for enrolled Americans to soar by an astounding 93 percent.

This drastic reduction in subsidies will also compel many healthy individuals to forgo insurance altogether, leaving a sicker population behind and forcing insurers to raise premiums

across the board. As a result, even families who do not receive these subsidies will see their premiums increase by 18 percent.

This single policy shift would strip health coverage from more than 5 million Americans, adding to the 10 million projected to lose insurance due to President Trump's Medicaid cuts.

Those fortunate enough to retain their insurance will face a staggering cost increase. A family of four earning just \$90,000 annually could see their premiums escalate by as much as 69 percent. That is an increase of over \$3,000 per year, and that is crushing for a working family.

The expiration of these subsidies will also inflict substantial harm on entrepreneurs and small business owners. These are people who comprise roughly 30 percent of marketplace enrollees.

I am deeply concerned about the chilling effect this premium hike will have on business creation and job growth, both of which are already under significant strain in Trump's economy.

Democrats stand ready to work collaboratively with our Republican colleagues to fund the government in a bipartisan spirit. We are eager to negotiate in good faith on a responsible budget that delivers for all Americans.

Extending these vital tax subsidies is but one of many critical items on the table.

Let me be unequivocal on one other issue. No budget proposal that permits additional rescissions is worthy of any serious consideration. Any long-term budget should be shielded against further rescissions because we have already seen this administration's willingness to rescind funds approved in a bipartisan fashion by Congress, canceling support for foreign aid and public broadcasting programs that enjoy broad bipartisan backing.

The administration has also announced plans to exploit a little-known mechanism known as a pocket rescission to unilaterally cancel even more foreign aid.

Of deep concern to myself and Marylanders, President Trump has threatened to rescind funding that is vital to the reconstruction of the Francis Scott Key Bridge in Baltimore, a project critical not only to our local economy but to the Nation as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to insist that any budget we pass categorically reject any further illegal impoundments.

The power of the purse rests solely with Congress. If the President seeks to cut funding, he must do so through proper channels: by coming to Congress and requesting a lawful change.

Let's be sure to remember that in the days ahead.

VACCINES PROTECT OUR COMMUNITIES

(Mr. CISNEROS of California was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the dangerous actions of the Health and Human Services Secretary in regard to vaccines.

Vaccines play a critical role in protecting our entire population in the United States. They are the most powerful tool we have against serious infectious diseases. They help our immune system learn how to fight against viruses and prevent disease from spreading to our neighbors, communities, and loved ones.

A 2024 CDC study showed that routine vaccines have prevented over 508 million cases of illness in children. The impact is immeasurable. That is hundreds of millions of children who are saved from having to suffer through a miserable illness. On top of that, their family, friends, neighbors, classmates, and loved ones are all able to stay guarded from these viruses and diseases.

It is really all thanks to modern medicine, science, research, and the proven success of vaccines.

The United States military administers 17 vaccines to military personnel on the basis of occupation, location of their deployment, and mission requirements.

Once common diseases like polio, tetanus, and hepatitis B are now almost unheard of, thanks to routine vaccinations.

Vaccines have become so effective that people have forgotten the serious threat that they guard against in our communities, and now, they are trying to politicize one of the most revolutionary developments of modern medicine.

Health and Human Services Secretary Kennedy has been on a mission to spread misinformation and fear-mongering to scare parents away from getting their kids lifesaving vaccines. Not only that, he is attacking the research and medical institutions that advance our health systems. He has canceled nearly \$500 million in contracts to develop vaccines.

This blatant disregard for the health of our communities is reckless and puts all of us in danger.

As Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness at the Pentagon, I oversaw public health efforts at the Pentagon during the COVID-19 pandemic, which included acquiring and distributing vaccines to military personnel.

In order to maintain the strength of our military, we need people equipped for whatever the world throws at them, and that includes diseases.

Operation Warp Speed was a success. Over 95 percent of Active-Duty personnel were vaccinated. While no vaccine is perfect, only three individuals who took the vaccine while on Active Duty died from COVID-19 complications.

Operation Warp Speed was so much of a success that Secretary Esper included a binder labeled "Operation Warp Speed" in his official portrait. It

is just too bad that no one can any longer see it hanging in the Pentagon.

I find it ironic that the President who spoke out against the distribution of the vaccines for so long is now trying to embrace its success.

Our society has become healthier and more productive because of vaccines. Vaccines have become a global investment in a strong public system.

In our modern times, we no longer need to worry about sending our kids to school, going to large sporting events or concerts, or even traveling, all because of the major reduction in the spread of disease. Vaccines are to thank for that.

There are several consequences to rejecting vaccines and the science behind them. Mr. Kennedy's recent comments attacking vaccines are destroying decades of work and community trust that has fostered safer and healthier communities, trust that is based on good science. It is careless and dangerous, but he continues to follow in the footsteps of the President and create false narratives to spread fear and distrust.

This anti-vaccine mission he is on is going to prevent families and children from getting the proper healthcare that they need. It is going to significantly limit the resources that families have to keep themselves healthy and protect themselves against infectious disease.

It should not be a political issue. This is about the health of our people, the health of our Nation.

Every American should be alarmed about the detrimental impact that this will have on our communities across the Nation and globe, which is why I am fully committed to keeping our country safe and healthy, lowering the cost of healthcare, and making medical resources more accessible.

All Americans deserve access to quality healthcare, including critical preventive care like vaccines.

Secretary Kennedy should be lauded for his campaign to remove dyes from food, and I think that is admirable, but removing dyes from drinks and foods won't protect kids from the threat of measles, chicken pox, polio, or other diseases.

Vaccines are safe, effective, and our best defense against life-threatening diseases.

I urge all Americans to trust our scientists, our doctors, and decades of research. Get vaccinated to protect yourself, your families, and our communities. We have the power to maintain a healthy society and prevent deadly infectious disease.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUEST) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Father of lights, from whom comes every perfect gift and in whom there is no shadow, open our hearts this day to receive Your wisdom. As we commemorate the founding of our Nation's Constitution, illuminate our understanding of Your divine will and rekindle within us gratitude for the guidance You offered our Nation's Founders in the establishment of American democracy more than two centuries ago.

For even in the early and precarious years of our country's beginnings, when social anxiety and political turmoil threatened the future of this fledgling Nation, Lord, in Your mercy, You built the house that is our United States so that the framers of our Constitution would not have fought for or built this government in vain.

As You granted our Founders a vision of a more perfect Union, grant to our leaders and all American citizens today the will to preserve national unity to defend freedom and to uphold the common good.

As You revealed the principles of liberty and justice to the first lawmakers, reveal to us anew how, when we ground our faith and live our lives in You, the enjoyment of those rights naturally follows.

Eternal God, we thank You for our noble past. We pray for integrity in the pursuit of peace in our present, and we look with hope toward a future worthy of Your blessing.

In Your sovereign name, we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PETITIONING TO CHECK PARTISAN MAP

(Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object. Does the Speaker know when the Speaker of the House will be addressing Member security in an adequate fashion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not asking a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the Speaker know what the plan is to keep Members secure due to all the security threats and the assassination attempts and assassinations we have seen around the country?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is still not a proper parliamentary inquiry and is not a question that can be answered by the Chair.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the State legislature may have forced through their partisan map, but in Missouri, the final word belongs to the people. Our constitution gives Missourians the right to check the politicians through the petition process.

No one asked for this map. Communities didn't demand it. Voters didn't vote for it. It was written to serve the administration, not Missouri. When politicians get it wrong, citizens have the chance to make it right.

That is why the petition process is so important. It is a chance for Missourians across the State—urban, rural, north, south, Black, White, Hispanic, Asian—to come together and say our voices matter, our votes matter, and we will decide what representation looks like.

This is bigger than party politics. It is about who holds the power in our democracy. I believe the power is in the people of Missouri—more specifically, in the pen and signatures of the people of Missouri as we petition to save our democracy.

WARNING ABOUT SUPPRESSING RIGHTS ON CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. LATIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on his reservation.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object because Members of the House are open to all sorts of threats, Mr. Speaker. I am just curious, do you know when the Speaker of the House will be putting forward a plan to keep Members safe?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already responded that this is not a proper parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair cannot advise further.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, today, we celebrate the 238th birthday of the U.S. Constitution, and we reflect on the document that enshrines the freedoms that we hold dear.

At the heart of those freedoms is the First Amendment, the right to free speech. It protects popular speech and speech that challenges, provokes, and offends. That is the point.

This week, the Attorney General said that the Department of Justice would "absolutely target you, go after you" for so-called hate speech, a dangerous misreading of the Constitution. Though she has since walked it back, the message was clear: This administration would rather silence dissent than defend liberty.

I hear defense of the Second Amendment, the right to bear arms, but I want to make sure that we defend all amendments, including the Fifth Amendment for due process, and the 10th Amendment, rights that are reserved for the States and the people from the Federal Government.

Our rights don't come with an asterisk. We don't surrender the First Amendment or any others to political convenience.

On this Constitution Day, let us remember the greatest threat to democracy is not exercising our rights. It is the effort to suppress those rights.

MEDICALLY TAILORED MEALS SAVE LIVES AND LOWER HEALTHCARE COSTS

(Mr. McGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, food is medicine, and medically tailored meals provide people living with chronic illness essential nutrition to improve their health and keep them out of the hospital.

Incredible providers like Community Servings in my home State of Massachusetts, God's Love We Deliver in New York City, and dozens of agencies across the country have proven these meals work.

Among individuals with complex health conditions, MTMs have led to a

70 percent drop in emergency room visits and cut hospital admissions in half. If all eligible patients received MTMs, studies show that we could save over \$32 billion in the first year alone.

Today, I am reintroducing bipartisan, bicameral legislation with Representatives MALLIOTAKIS, PINGREE, FITZPATRICK, and EVANS and Senators BOOKER, MARSHALL, SMITH, and CASSIDY to pilot the coverage of MTMs in traditional Medicare. Our bill, which expands access to these lifesaving meals, will lead to billions of dollars in savings without adding one dime to the deficit.

I urge my colleagues to join the growing bipartisan Food is Medicine movement and pass our medically tailored meals bill. Let's work together to end hunger now.

□ 1210

HONORING DR. G.V.V. RAO

(Mr. SUBRAMANYAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. G.V.V. Rao, a beloved husband, father, grandfather, and true community leader.

Dr. Rao dedicated his life to service, both here in Virginia and around the world. His career and work on global development took him to the World Bank, the United Nations, and the Asian Development Bank.

In the community, Dr. Rao founded the Balavikas of Fairfax, an organization to promote spiritual values and education for kids in Northern Virginia. His PROCEED Project helped mentor low-income students in India as they pursued higher education.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Rao's legacy lives on in all the lives he touched and the communities that he strengthened. May he rest in peace.

FILLING FIREFIGHTER POSITIONS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

(Ms. ELFRETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give voice to an issue that has gone unaddressed for far too long, and it is one this body must take up before it is too late and lives are lost. We must address the alarmingly low staffing levels of firefighters on our military installations.

Recent reports indicate that the military service intends to eliminate vacant firefighter positions, restrict the use of overtime, and interpret requirements in a manner that could lead to station closures.

Let me be clear. While staffing level shortages have been an ongoing challenge, these new actions, coupled with the continued hiring freeze, put our servicemembers in harm's way.

It is why Congresswoman KIGGANS and I wrote to the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to ensure robust emergency services that maintain safety and mission readiness across the Force.

Across the DOD, more than 8,800 civilian firefighters respond to structural fires, aircraft emergencies, hazardous materials incidents, and other life-threatening events each year.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more critical and all-American cause or more of a win-win than having the backs of our fire firefighters and our servicemembers.

DELIVERING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. WALKINSHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, across America, hardworking people are struggling to pay their bills. This includes housing, groceries, healthcare, and more. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been cut due to the DOGE policies. Our economy is sputtering, and the tariffs are jacking up prices.

The so-called big, beautiful bill will decimate Medicaid, taking healthcare from seniors, children, and working families, while driving up premiums.

The President has told the majority not to negotiate with our side to keep the government open. The budget that has been introduced will drive up everyday costs, including healthcare premiums.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to come together and deliver what the American people need, which is access to affordable healthcare and a government that is funded and functional.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable HAKEEM JEFFRIES, Democratic Leader:

SEPTEMBER 17, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: Pursuant to Section 2(b)(4) of P.L. 118-144, the Commission to Study the Potential Transfer of the Weitzman National Museum of American Jewish History to the Smithsonian Institution Act, I am pleased to appoint the following individual to the Commission to Study the Potential Transfer of the Weitzman National Museum of American Jewish History to the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Philip Darivoff of Short Hills, New Jersey

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS REFORM ACT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 5125) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to terminate the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-13 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5125

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act of 2025”.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMISSION.

(a) TERMINATION.—*The District of Columbia Home Rule Act is amended by striking section 434 (sec. 1-204.34, D.C. Official Code).*

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES.—

(1) DESIGNATION OF CHIEF JUDGES BY PRESIDENT.—*Section 431(b) of such Act (sec. 1-204.31(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the District of Columbia Judicial Nominating Commission established by section 434” and inserting “the President”.*

(2) APPOINTMENT BY PRESIDENT.—*Section 433(a) of such Act (sec. 1-204.33(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “Except as provided in section 434(d)(1), the President shall nominate, from the list of persons recommended to him by the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission established under section 434,” and inserting “The President shall nominate,“.*

(3) QUALIFICATIONS OF JUDGES.—*Section 433(b) of such Act (sec. 1-204.33(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended—*

(A) by adding “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4); and

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “or of the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission”.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—*Section 11-1528(a)(2), District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (C).*

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—*The table of contents of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 434.*

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—*The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to appointments made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARCIA) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5125, the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Reform Act.

This legislation aligns with the appointment of D.C. judges with the constitutional process for appointing members of the Federal judiciary. This bill preserves the President's authority to nominate, with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, anyone deemed appropriate to sit on the D.C. court.

The current system, where the President is restricted to nominating only those candidates put forward by the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission, inappropriately limits the President's authority.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for his leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill, which would eliminate the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission and give a President, any President, the sole power to make nominations for D.C. local courts, which deal with municipal issues.

Right now, under the Home Rule Act, the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission submits a list of three candidates for each judicial vacancy. Of course, then it is considered by the President. This bill would wipe away the commission, and it would allow the President to directly appoint and have full control over the selection of these judges.

This is an absurd level of Federal control over local judges. Every State and territory in the United States selects its own judges. Only in D.C. do Republicans think that President Trump should decide who the local judges are.

Let's also be honest about what the bill is really about. This has nothing to do with public safety. It is a power grab to take away power and authority from over 700,000 residents of this district.

Let's be clear. D.C. does face a judicial vacancy crisis. There are currently 15 open seats across the Superior Court of D.C. and D.C. Court of Appeals. There are 13 on the superior court side and two on the court of appeals. Why do those vacancies actually exist? The commission has submitted names for every single one of those open seats.

The bottleneck is not the commission. It is the slow pace of nominations by the President and confirmations by this Senate. The Senate can solve this tomorrow, and we know who controls the Senate. It is the Republicans.

Let's be honest about what this bill is really about. It is not about the Constitution. It is about partisanship. The House majority wants to give Donald Trump the ability to select judges for local municipal matters for Washington, D.C., and bypass the current commission process that exists.

This is another attempt for Republicans to try to gut D.C.'s nonpartisan judiciary and replace it with partisan rightwing judges.

The legislation does nothing to improve the judicial system. It strips away one of the few tools D.C. residents have to shape their courts, and it erodes judicial independence. The bill isn't necessary. It is undemocratic. It really goes to the independence of our courts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the young chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, what we have heard today is a continuation of this lame excuse of politics and on Donald Trump. The gentleman from California did allude to it but really did not get into much more of the data.

□ 1220

The bottom line is from 9/30/20, 2/25/23, 6/30/23, 7/28/23, 3/22/24, 4/12/24, 10/1/24, each of these people were nominated by the distinguished gentleman, the former President of the United States, Mr. Biden.

This is not political. This is getting the work done that Washington, D.C. needs, and this commission process that we go through does not work.

I know we wanted to hear that this is all related to Donald Trump and Republicans wanting to control the process that goes on so that we can control Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is not working is the reason why I am on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 5125 is about a process that can work. The gentleman from California is correct. A lot of it is political, but what it is to do is to say that if the people of this country have chosen the President of the United States, then that is the direction we will go. We will give that President, whether it be Republican or Democrat, whether it be a man or a woman, we will give that President the opportunity for the control of this nomination and the system here in Washington, D.C.

We have got a lot at risk. Mr. Speaker, we have got a lot at risk which is

the same reason why President Trump finally had the guts—yes, I will call them guts—to call in the National Guard to take on the crime presence that exists in Washington, D.C.

Members of Congress have had their cars stolen. We have had Members of Congress who were assaulted. We have had staff members of this body who were killed. People who come to this town from across the United States want, need, and expect that Washington, D.C. does not become or continue to be a work-free drug zone.

Washington, D.C. should be safe for visitors not just of the United States, but for international visitors who visit also. The basis of that which Chairman COMER is bringing to the floor today is to look at, from top to bottom, not just the judicial system, but really the entire process of the court system.

I have some background in this. My father served as a chief judge of the Western District of Texas in San Antonio. He served as FBI Director for President Reagan, President Bush, and President Clinton. He understood firsthand that control of crime has a lot to do with how you deal with criminals, Mr. Speaker.

This opportunity that we bring today to the floor is to go back to a process that works and is a process that is driven by the President of the United States who also has authority and responsibility over this beautiful city.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my good friend that in Texas local judges are elected by Texas citizens, not chosen directly by the President. In this case, in this bill, they want to bypass any sort of local control of the selection of judges and have these appointees be chosen directly by Donald Trump. That is wrong, and Members should oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill, which eliminates the District of Columbia's already small role in the selection of its local judges.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters opposing this bill from D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser, the entire D.C. Council, D.C. Attorney Brian Schwalb, and the D.C. Bar.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: As Mayor and Chief Executive Officer of the District of Columbia, I am proud of the work we have accomplished to invest in our people, strengthen our neighborhoods, and drive down crime. Building on this progress, my Administration established the Safe and Beautiful Emergency Operations Center to coordinate public safety and beautification efforts as the presidential emergency declaration ends. This structure

ensures that DC will remain proactive—bringing together local and federal partners to sustain momentum on reducing crime and improving quality of life for every resident.

We have worked collaboratively with this Committee on shared priorities, including public safety, the federal Return to Work, implementing a DC budget Fiscal Year 2025 fix (which is still pending in the House) and revitalizing the RFK campus; but I write now to ask you to reject 13 of the DC bills before you today that encroach on DC's Home Rule:

Bills like H.R. 5183, the District of Columbia Home Rule Improvement Act, make the District less efficient, competitive, and responsive to the needs of a highly complex unique local government that serves local, county and state functions. Bogging down legislative and executive action only adds costs and uncertainty, making it more difficult to handle the economic headwinds and growth opportunities ahead.

Bills like H.R. 5214, the District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act, make DC less safe. Replacing our very effective pre-trial detention regime, which focuses on charged violent offenses and repeat violent offenders, not just on cash bail. I credit recent changes to our laws related to pre-trial detention for helping to drive down violent crime in the last two years.

And the bills to abolish the Judicial Nominations Commission and to convert the elected DC Attorney General to a Presidentially appointed legal officer for the District are both less democratic and untenable for District operations. The Judicial Nomination Commission, with seven members appointed by the Mayor, DC Council, President, US District Court for DC, and the DC Bar, works. As recently as last month, President Trump nominated three federal judicial nominees who were selected from the Commission's candidate pool—a process that demonstrates the value of maintaining local input. DC residents also voted to elect an Attorney General who represents the public interest. Changes to these charter agencies would significantly undercut the already thin ties to autonomy that limited home rule provides.

Finally, I urge you not to upend our three-part education funding SOAR Act. I have long supported the program to expand opportunity for DC students. However, my support has always been contingent on parity among all three education sectors—public, private, and charter—and this approach is working. We will not support changes that tip the scales away from this core principle of fairness for DC families. As the fastest improving urban school system, DC has become a model for urban education. We outpace the national average on all tested subject areas. We boast free, full-day Pre-K access serving more than 13,200 young learners—an investment which supports our children and our workforce. DC ranked top of the nation in parental satisfaction regarding school choice. Mayoral control, council oversight, and deep, targeted investments in our students, teachers, and buildings made these remarkable achievements possible.

I look forward to continuing a productive partnership with the Committee—one that respects the will of DC residents and honors the principles of home rule. Together, we can build on our successes while protecting the autonomy that, as history reflects, has made our city stronger.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chair, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,

Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The Council of the District of Columbia is aware that the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is planning to mark up more than a dozen proposed measures that would severely and negatively impact the operations, public safety, and autonomy of the District of Columbia. We ask that you oppose these measures in full, save one, H.R. 2693, District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal of Legislation Act. While we have not seen the final text of this legislation, the public summary of H.R. 2693 is consistent with the long held request by the District of Columbia to allow the ability to electronically transfer legislative acts to Congress, rather than only allowing physical copies be transferred. The challenge and barriers created by this current requirement were clearly exposed during both the recent COVID pandemic restrictions as well as the Capitol campus restrictions following the January 6, 2021 attacks on the Capitol.

The other 13 measures that have been shared with us would do direct and serious harm to the District of Columbia and we urge you to reject these measures completely. These bills represent an unprecedented attack on the autonomy and home rule of our local government and the more than 700,000 Americans that call it home. The breadth of these bills is remarkable, and if passed, would result in an erosion of accountability and public safety for the District of Columbia. They range from eliminating and replacing our elected and accountable Attorney General for the District of Columbia with a President's hand-picked and unaccountable associate requiring no confirmation by the U.S. Senate and no local ties, to a full repeal of multiple local DC laws that have been in place for many years, if not decades, that are tested, proven, and effective components of our public safety infrastructure and ecosystem. The effect of these Congressional repeals would put our legal and Court system into chaos and directly undermine successful tools that focus on serious accountability and effective rehabilitation when a crime occurs. As always, when revisions or amendments to DC laws are necessary, those changes should only take place within our local legislature which has the best capacity to provide effective oversight and accountable actions for the residents of the District of Columbia.

We respectfully request that all members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and all members of Congress, reject these harmful measures whether in committee mark up or before the full House of Representatives. Given the breadth of the multiple measures before you, we also request an opportunity to provide a more in-depth discussion of each bill before the Committee's mark-up, especially in light that the Committee will not hold public hearings on these measures.

Sincerely,

Chairman Phil Mendelson; Councilmember Anita Bonds, At-Large; Councilmember Robert White, Jr.; Councilmember Brooke Pinto, Ward 2; Councilmember Janeese Lewis George, Ward 4; Councilmember Charles Allen, Ward 6; Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, At-Large; Councilmember Christina Henderson, At-Large; Councilmember Brianne Nadeau, Ward 1; Councilmember

Matthew Frumin, Ward 3; Councilmember Zachary Parker, Ward 5; Councilmember Wendell Felder, Ward 7; Councilmember Trayon White, Sr., Ward 8.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,

September 9, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,

Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,

Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is scheduled to markup fourteen bills tomorrow related to the operations of the District of Columbia. With the exception of H.R. 2693, the District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal Act, I write in strong opposition to these bills. They address inherently local issues and laws that were passed after careful consideration by the District's elected representatives, who are directly accountable to District residents. Members of this very Committee have long advocated for the principles of federalism on which this nation was founded. They have consistently condemned federal overreach and fought forcefully and convincingly for the uniquely American values of local control, freedom, and self-governance. These principles should apply to the more than 700,000 people who call Washington, DC home, just as they do for your constituents across the country.

I specifically want to call attention to the significant incursion on local self-governance reflected in two bills, the District of Columbia Attorney General Appointment Reform Act and the District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act. Both laws would displace the ability of District residents to have a voice in the selection of local leaders who wield significant power over local judicial matters: the judges on our local courts and the Attorney General for the District. The judges on the DC Court of Appeals and DC Superior Court rule on inherently local matters such as criminal prosecutions, landlord-tenant cases, probate proceedings, civil cases, and divorce proceedings, all of which have profoundly important impact on our community. For more than 50 years, the Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC) has successfully allowed DC residents to have a voice in judicial appointments, while also granting the President and Senate a role in confirming our judges. I urge the Committee not to overturn that well-established process.

The DC Attorney General, as the District's chief law officer, is also responsible for local legal issues, namely, protecting the District and its residents in a wide range of matters, such as enforcing child support laws, handling abuse and neglect proceedings in the child welfare system, enforcing our housing code, and defending District agencies and officers when they are sued. In no other place in the United States are such local issues determined by a federally appointed person with no local accountability. The proposed legislation would be especially undemocratic in light of the fact that, in 2010, an overwhelming majority of District voters (76 percent) exercised their right to amend the District Charter to make the DC Attorney General an independent, elected office, rather than a position appointed by and subordinate to the Mayor. With that vote, District residents clearly expressed their desire that the Attorney General should be independent and accountable to them. The pending bill would

displace that choice in favor of installing an Attorney General accountable not to District residents, but to the President. Given that the U.S. Attorney for the District is already appointed by the President, if passed, this bill would concentrate all criminal and civil litigation authority in the President, divesting the District and its residents of any local control over these essential functions.

No one knows or cares more about keeping DC safe than DC residents who work, live and raise their families here. Our democratically elected officials work closely with local law enforcement, policy experts, and community leadership to pass laws that are in the best interests of all Washingtonians. Substituting the will of DC voters with the whim of federal politicians is undemocratic and un-American.

I urge you to reject these measures and uphold the values Congress sought to advance more than 50 years ago when it passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: that District residents should enjoy the “powers of local self-government” that all other Americans enjoy. See DC Code § 1-201.02.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

DC BAR,
Washington, DC,
September 12, 2025.

Re: District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission.

JAMES COMER, Chair,
ROBERT GARCIA, Ranking Member,
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: I am writing to you on behalf of the District of Columbia Bar (the D.C. Bar) and its Board of Governors in support of the vital work of the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC or Commission) and its essential role in maintaining the integrity and excellence of the District of Columbia's courts. In particular, the D.C. Bar supports the views presented by members of the Commission in their September 9, 2025, letter, a copy of which is attached here. The continued work of the JNC is important and valuable to D.C. Bar members, District residents, and the administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

Congress created the Commission in 1973 to ensure that the District's local judges are selected based on professional qualifications, experience, judicial temperament, and commitment to justice. Comprised of Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia, and the D.C. Bar, the JNC is a hallmark of bipartisan commitment to merit-based judicial selection, and has produced one of the nation's most well-respected local court systems.

The JNC's mission is straightforward: to recommend to the President highly qualified individuals to fill judicial vacancies on the District's local courts, and to select the chief judges of the D.C. Court of Appeals and the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. For more than five decades, through rigorous evaluation of legal experience, integrity, intellectual capacity, and community standing, the Commission has consistently provided the President with a carefully vetted pool of highly qualified nominees.

Despite having numerous vacancies in recent years, our local courts constantly handle demanding caseloads comprising complex matters. The commitment and dedication of our local judges are a testament to the work and value of the Commission.

The D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission represents the best of American democratic institutions: independent, merit-based, and committed to the public good. Its continued effectiveness depends on timely confirmation of nominees and sustained support for its mission and recognition of its vital contribution to the administration of justice in the District of Columbia. We respectfully urge your continued support for this exemplary institution and its critical work in the service of justice in the nation's capital.

Sincerely,

SADINA MONTANI,
President, D.C. Bar.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I also insert into the RECORD a letter on this bill from the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2025.

Re H.R. 5125, District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act.

JAMES COMER, Chair,
ROBERT GARCIA, Ranking Member,
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: Members of the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission respectfully submit this letter to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in response to H.R. 5125, District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act.

The District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC or Commission) was established by Congress on December 24, 1973 (Public Law 93-198, 87 Stat. 796). The JNC is composed of seven members—two appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia, two by the Board of Governors of the District of Columbia Bar Association (Unified), one by the Council of the District of Columbia, one by the President of the United States, and one judicial member appointed by the Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Each member is appointed for a six-year term, except for the member appointed by the President, who serves a five-year term.

The JNC solicits, screens, and recommends a panel of three candidates to the President of the United States for each judicial vacancy on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. From the panel of names recommended by the JNC, the President nominates a person for each vacancy and submits the nominee's name to the United States Senate for confirmation. The JNC also designates the Chief Judges for the District of Columbia courts.

The JNC, using a merit-based selection process, works to provide the citizens of the District of Columbia with the best possible court system by (a) soliciting a diverse and talented pool of applicants for each judicial vacancy; (b) screening applicants to ensure they have the requisite experience, skill, temperament, and qualifications for judicial office; and (c) recommending the three most qualified applicants to the President of the United States for his or her consideration in selecting a nominee to fill each judicial vacancy on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

Since its first list of applicants was sent to President R. Gerald Ford, Jr. on May 8, 1975, the JNC has recommended more than 93 candidates for 31 vacancies on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (Court of Appeals) and more than 513 candidates for 171 vacancies on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia (Superior Court). Working with

both Republican and Democratic Presidents for more than 50 years, the Senate has confirmed 29 Presidential nominations to the Court of Appeals and 159 to the Superior Court. To date, the Senate has confirmed more Republican Presidential nominees to both courts—17 of 29 on the Court of Appeals and 83 of 159 on the Superior Court. All the Presidential nominees were selected from lists the JNC sent to the President pursuant to D.C. Code §§ 1-204.31, 1-204.33. Arguably, the judicial nomination process in the District of Columbia is one of the best non-partisan processes in the country, a process that President Trump engaged in during his first term (with 10 confirmations to the local courts) and on September 2, 2025, when he nominated candidates for three vacancies on the Superior Court.

In conclusion, the Commission members are united in expressing our pride in the JNC's lengthy history of proficient service. The Commission process has been effective for over 50 years, working with both Republican and Democratic administrations. Our process is carefully designed to ensure that the over 700,000 residents of our city have a voice in judicial appointments, while also respecting the President's authority in nominating individuals for the critical role of judicial service in the District of Columbia. We stand in support of the JNC's current role and configuration, and we look forward to continuing to serve our city in discharging our critically important responsibilities.

Respectfully Submitted,

For the Commission:

Hon. Marie C. Johns, PPC-Leftwich, Washington, DC.

Benjamin F. Wilson, Esq., Washington, DC.

Addy R. Schmitt, Esq., Kropf Moseley Schmitt, Washington, DC.

Vincent H. Cohen, Jr., Esq., Dechert LLP, Washington, DC.

Yaida O. Ford, Esq., Ford Law Pros PC, Washington, DC.

Hon. Linda W. Cropp, Washington, DC.

Hon. Tanya S. Chutkan, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, United States Courthouse, Washington, DC.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under the D.C. Home Rule Act, the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate—a chamber in which D.C. has no representation—appoints judges to the local D.C. courts. The President must make a nomination from a list of candidates recommended by the Judicial Nomination Commission. The establishment of the Judicial Nomination Commission provided D.C. with three, albeit limited, roles in the nomination of its local judges. First, members of the commission must be D.C. residents. Second, D.C. appoints three of the seven members of the commission. Third, the commission holds a public comment period on applicants for a vacancy on the local D.C. courts, allowing D.C. residents to express their views on applicants.

Republicans claim the Judicial Nomination Commission is unconstitutional because it limits the President's authority to make nominations. They are wrong. The commission has been in existence for 50 years. Congress, not the President, has plenary authority over D.C.

Congress also has plenary authority over the territories, and Congress has given them authority to select their local judges without any role whatsoever for the President or Congress.

I refer my Republican colleagues to the Supreme Court's decision in 2020 regarding the appointments to the Puerto Rico financial control board, which Congress established pursuant to its plenary authority over Puerto Rico. The court held the appointments clause of the Constitution does not "restrict the appointment of local officers that Congress vests with primarily local duties" pursuant to the territorial or District clauses of the Constitution. Local D.C. judges are local officers that Congress vests with primarily local duties pursuant to the District clause.

The longstanding judicial vacancy crisis on the local D.C. courts is not due to any failure of the Judicial Nomination Commission. The commission always meets its 60-day statutory deadline to submit a list of names for a vacancy to the President. The crisis exists because the President and, to a larger extent, the Senate, regardless of the party in power, do not prioritize local D.C. judges. For example, there has been a vacancy on D.C.'s highest local court since 2013.

Congress should give authority to the over 700,000 D.C. residents to select their local judges in any manner they choose. D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves.

Since Republicans do not trust D.C. residents with self-government, they should at least address the longstanding vacancy crisis in the local D.C. courts, which is harming public safety and access to justice. A simple solution is to make an appointment to the local D.C. courts effective 30 days after the President makes a nomination, unless Congress enacts a disapproval resolution during that period. That is essentially the same process used for congressional review of legislation enacted by D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the D.C. Judicial Nominations Reform Act and to grant D.C. statehood instead. Free D.C.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman coming forth, as she does represent the District of Columbia, but I think in the argument it is important to note that these are not just local judges that we are talking about. They don't handle any matter that is related to a ticket or parking ticket, local matters. In fact, they deal with serious matters, and that is why it comes to the attention of the United States Senate and the President of the United States.

This bill does not remove any sitting judges on either the D.C. Superior Court or the D.C. Court of Appeals, but, in fact, we believe it is important. As the gentlewoman noted, since 2013 we still have people who have been hanging out and not approved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go through this, because I really did

not do the due diligence to know why there are people here who have not been approved. They are still pending.

What I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that we have lots of time since 2013 where Republicans and Democrats who were in charge in the United States Senate could have moved these nominations forward, and they chose not to.

□ 1230

I am simply standing and saying that I believe that today this bill needs to be passed because Washington, D.C., and the sitting courts do need additional judges. They need competent people who would be prepared to move forward.

If there is one President who would nominate and get this done, it would be Donald Trump. Donald Trump deeply believes in the success of Washington, D.C. He believes Washington, D.C., should be a place that is safe and has good judges. This will be an opportunity for us not only to understand a different way to handle this but a way that we can look back and say we have made Washington, D.C., just a little bit better because the Republican Party cares deeply about Washington, its success, and, mostly, the safety of the people who live here.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the young chairman for allowing me to bring this bill together.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just will clarify for the gentleman from Texas that these are not Federal circuit judges. They have the same jurisdiction as State and local judges. That is what actually the bill presented says. These are local judges. They are not circuit judges. They are not Federal judges.

Let's be clear what this is about. This is about allowing Donald Trump to select local judges for D.C. and bypass a commission system that is currently in place where the President still has an ability to select from a panel of different judges. There is no State in the United States, in our country, that allows the President to directly select local judges. This is an outrageous attempt to take away power from 700,000 residents and to hurt our independent judiciary system here in the District.

This bill is not about safety. It is not about the Constitution. It has nothing to do with Federal Circuit court judges. It is a power grab for Donald Trump to self-select judges.

Finally, as I close, I remind all our friends that all of these D.C. bills in front of us are about Donald Trump trying to play Mayor of Washington, D.C. If he wants to be mayor, he should resign from President and run for mayor himself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Another day on the House floor where the Republicans try to address

the D.C. crime crisis with serious, substantive solutions and another day where the Democrats try to act like there is no crime problem in Washington, D.C., and reverberate the symptoms of their Trump derangement syndrome.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Sessions legislation which corrects an inappropriate limitation on Presidential authority to appoint judges in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICING PROTECTION ACT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 5143) to establish standards for law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia to engage in vehicular pursuits of suspects, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR). Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-11 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Policing Protection Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. VEHICULAR PURSUITS BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) AMENDMENT.—*The Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-345) is amended—*

(1) *in subtitle S of title I—*

(A) *in the heading, by striking "LIMITATIONS ON THE";*

(B) *in section 127(a) (sec. 5-365.01(a), D.C. Official Code)—*

(i) *by striking paragraphs (1) through (5);*

(ii) *in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: " , except*

that such term does not include a sworn federal law enforcement officer of a covered federal law enforcement agency as defined in section 11712(d) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 5–133.17(d), D.C. Official Code).";

(iii) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(iv) by striking paragraphs (8) through (11); and

(v) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (3); and

(C) in section 128 (sec. 5–365.02, D.C. Official Code), by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following: "If a law enforcement officer encounters a suspect fleeing in a motor vehicle, the officer may engage in a vehicular pursuit of the suspect unless the officer, or a higher-ranking official with supervisory authority over the officer, reasonably believes that—

"(1) vehicular pursuit would—

"(A) entail an unacceptable risk of harm to a person other than the suspect; or

"(B) be futile; or

"(2) the suspect can be apprehended more effectively or expeditiously by a means other than vehicular pursuit.;" and

(2) in the table of contents, by striking the item relating to subtitle S of title I and inserting the following:

"SUBTITLE S. USE OF VEHICULAR PURSUITS BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS 33".

(b) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORT ON PURSUITALERT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(1) evaluate the costs and benefits of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia adopting PursuitAlert or another similar technology capable of alerting members of the public to the presence of a police pursuit in their immediate vicinity; and

(2) publish a report on the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1) and submit the report to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARCÍA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 5143, the District of Columbia Po-

licing Protection Act of 2025. This bill repeals subtitle S of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 and replaces it with policies empowering police to pursue a suspect fleeing in a vehicle.

The 2022 act imposes burdensome restrictions on police pursuit of criminal suspects. This has resulted in less justice for victims of crime in Washington, D.C., and more opportunities for criminals, who would otherwise be apprehended, to continue harming D.C. and surrounding communities.

This bill replaces subtitle S with policies that allow for vehicular pursuit of a suspect fleeing in a motor vehicle if the officer or supervisor deems it necessary, the most effective means of apprehension, and without unreasonable risk to bystanders.

I thank Representative CLAY HIGGINS for his leadership on this critical local policing reform legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support his bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill, which would overrule rules implemented by D.C.'s elected leaders on when Metropolitan Police officers should pursue a fleeing car.

Our debate here is a perfect example of why D.C. needs self-rule. We should be clear. High-speed chases are deadly. They often end in needless deaths, injuries, and devastating property damage.

Over 3,000 people died in police car chases in the U.S. between 2017 and 2022. Half of those deaths were innocent bystanders not involved in the chase. I will repeat. Half of the people who have died in police car chases were innocent bystanders. That should alarm every single one of us.

Across the country, Republican-led States have recognized the dangers of high-speed chases. States like Texas, Florida, and Tennessee have all implemented tighter standards to limit pursuits of violent criminals or imminent threats. They know the risks are too high for people who are innocent or could get caught up in one of these car crashes. That is the best practice, and D.C. is following the same path.

But my Republican colleagues want to interfere. They want to lower the standards to allow for more chases and more innocent people getting hurt.

I will remind us that this District is dense. Sidewalks oftentimes are small. Streets are tight. There are a lot of folks who live here. We should not have a one-size-fits-all policy for D.C. We should allow the people of D.C. to decide when a car chase is appropriate.

Congress should not require D.C. police to use tactics that the community does not want. D.C. residents should be empowered to decide when to authorize their police to use dangerous tactics.

Under current D.C. law, pursuits are allowed if a fleeing suspect has committed a violent crime, for example, or

poses an imminent threat to public safety and if the pursuit can be done in a way that minimizes the risk to innocent people.

□ 1240

We should not lower these standards, and certainly not with zero community input and no consultation with the D.C. Council, Mayor, or other folks who are actually trying to manage this city.

There are many tools, we know, that police officers can use to track suspects and make arrests. We should let the Council, the Mayor, and the police work together with the D.C. police to balance public safety, pedestrian safety, and proportionality. If D.C. residents don't like it, they can vote their elected officials out of office.

Today, Congress is again injecting itself as some sort of super city council to write laws for Washington, D.C. As a former mayor of 8 years, I worked with over 700 amazing men and women of a police department who were heroic in the work that they did. I know that, in conversations with our chief, our police officers, and our community, these decisions are best left to our communities to write the laws of when these police chases should actually go into effect.

While I appreciate the author and my friend, this bill, I believe, is unnecessary. It undermines home rule, and it will make D.C. less safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for recognizing me and allowing me to speak in support of H.R. 5143, the District of Columbia Policing Protection Act.

As a matter of background, Mr. Speaker, in January 2023, the D.C. Council enacted the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022, the CPJRA Act, D.C. Law 24–345, among numerous other police-related policy matters, most of which we advised against in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. We met with D.C. officials, including in hearings, and we advised against what they intended to do.

Mr. Speaker, included in those police-related policy matters in the act that they, indeed, passed in 2022 was subtitle S of the CPJRA, which imposed a host of restrictions on police pursuit of criminal suspects.

In doing so, the D.C. Council essentially made it illegal for police to pursue and apprehend criminals if they were fleeing in a vehicle by imposing a complex matrix of 14 factors that police officers have to consider for whether or not they would pursue a fleeing vehicle.

I speak from my own experience as a police officer. I have been, very likely, the only one involved in this debate for several years who has actually engaged in high-speed chases. I tried to add it up the other day, but I probably have engaged in a couple of hundred serious high-speed pursuits in the course of my career. I worked night shift for a long time, 9 years straight, 12-hour shifts. Night shift is when this stuff usually happens.

I am not talking about when someone doesn't stop right away. That is not a high-speed pursuit. Having to drive 100 miles an hour to catch up with somebody that you are pulling over is not a high-speed pursuit.

A high-speed pursuit is when they are running. This is something where the officer has to make very fast decisions, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we consider the totality of circumstances of where we are: Is that a suspect vehicle? Does it match a definition of something that has been put out through dispatch of a vehicle that we are looking for? Has it potentially been involved in a crime that requires police interaction in an effort to enforce and address that crime that took place?

There are a number of factors that a police officer has to figure, but it has to be an option that you can pursue that car.

What D.C. has done, one of the factors, Mr. Speaker, is if anyone in the suspect motor vehicle was afforded an opportunity to comply with an order to surrender any suspected dangerous weapons.

What the hell? There is no way a police officer can know that. There are too many factors, which basically means D.C. has made it illegal for police to pursue a vehicle.

That is what we are correcting here. We are restoring the discretion of the professional law enforcement officer to make a decision in a fraction of a second or two based upon his policies and training and the totality of circumstances of whether or not he needs to pursue that vehicle.

This is what my bill restores. The legislation repeals subtitle S of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 and replaces it with policies empowering police to make vehicular pursuit of a suspect fleeing in a motor vehicle if the officer or supervisor deems it necessary, that it is the most effective means of apprehension, and if it is without unreasonable risk to bystanders.

Let me say, in all of my vehicle pursuits, there have been a few crashes, but nobody has died. The only crash that I have ever been involved in during those pursuits was when I purposefully crashed the fleeing vehicle, which was the guy who had committed an armed robbery at a local hardware store, had pistol-whipped the manager of that store, made it to his car, and fired at officers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time yielded and the indulgence of the chairman. I urge strong support of H.R. 5143. It restores legitimate discretion to the police officers who actually work the streets of D.C.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) also for his service in law enforcement. I know that he is trying to help and trying to move public safety forward. I know that is his intention, but I just want to clarify a few things.

It has been mentioned that this committee or this bill has somehow been heard by a committee. We have not held a hearing on these bills. To clarify, our hearing on D.C. is actually tomorrow. There has been no coordination with the Mayor or the D.C. Council. They oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will clarify. It has been mentioned a few times when we have debated this bill that there are somehow 14 criteria that officers have to consider before engaging in a pursuit.

The law is very clear. The suspect must have “committed or attempted to commit a crime of violence, or poses an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury,” and the pursuit is “necessary to protect another person” from “serious bodily injury”; and not likely to cause injury to others; and “all other options have been exhausted or do not reasonably lend themselves to the circumstances.” That is actually what the law says.

I just wanted to note that. I am not sure what those 14 criteria are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this undemocratic and paternalistic bill, which amends D.C. law. The over 700,000 D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters opposing this bill from D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser, the entire D.C. Council, and D.C. Attorney General Brian Schwalb.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025.

Hon. JAMES CORNER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: As Mayor and Chief Executive Officer of the District of Columbia, I am proud of the work we have accomplished to invest in our people, strengthen our neighborhoods, and drive down crime. Building on this progress, my Administration established

the Safe and Beautiful Emergency Operations Center to coordinate public safety and beautification efforts as the presidential emergency declaration ends. This structure ensures that DC will remain proactive—bringing together local and federal partners to sustain momentum on reducing crime and improving quality of life for every resident.

We have worked collaboratively with this Committee on shared priorities, including public safety, the federal Return to Work, implementing a DC budget Fiscal Year 2025 fix (which is still pending in the House) and revitalizing the RFK campus; but I write now to ask you to reject 13 of the DC bills before you today that encroach on DC's Home Rule:

Bills like H.R. 5183, the District of Columbia Home Rule Improvement Act, make the District less efficient, competitive, and responsive to the needs of a highly complex unique local government that serves local, county and state functions. Bogging down legislative and executive action only adds costs and uncertainty, making it more difficult to handle the economic headwinds and growth opportunities ahead.

Bills like H.R. 5214, the District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act, make DC less safe. Replacing our very effective pre-trial detention regime, which focuses on charged violent offenses and repeat violent offenders, not just on cash bail. I credit recent changes to our laws related to pre-trial detention for helping to drive down violent crime in the last two years.

And the bills to abolish the Judicial Nominations Commission and to convert the elected DC Attorney General to a Presidentially appointed legal officer for the District are both less democratic and untenable for District operations. The Judicial Nominations Commission, with seven members appointed by the Mayor, DC Council, President, US District Court for DC, and the DC Bar, works. As recently as last month, President Trump nominated three federal judicial nominees who were selected from the Commission's candidate pool—a process that demonstrates the value of maintaining local input. DC residents also voted to elect an Attorney General who represents the public interest. Changes to these charter agencies would significantly undercut the already thin ties to autonomy that limited home rule provides.

Finally, I urge you not to end our three-part education funding SOAR Act. I have long supported the program to expand opportunity for DC students. However, my support has always been contingent on parity among all three education sectors—public, private, and charter—and this approach is working. We will not support changes that tip the scales away from this core principle of fairness for DC families. As the fastest improving urban school system, DC has become a model for urban education. We outpace the national average on all tested subject areas. We boast free, full-day Pre-K access serving more than 13,200 young learners—an investment which supports our children and our workforce. DC ranked top of the nation in parental satisfaction regarding school choice. Mayoral control, council oversight, and deep, targeted investments in our students, teachers, and buildings made these remarkable achievements possible.

I look forward to continuing a productive partnership with the Committee—one that respects the will of DC residents and honors the principles of home rule. Together, we can build on our successes while protecting the autonomy that, as history reflects, has made our city stronger.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chair, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The Council of the District of Columbia is aware that the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is planning to mark up more than a dozen proposed measures that would severely and negatively impact the operations, public safety, and autonomy of the District of Columbia. We ask that you oppose these measures in full, save one, H.R. 2693, District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal of Legislation Act. While we have not seen the final text of this legislation, the public summary of H.R. 2693 is consistent with the long held request by the District of Columbia to allow the ability to electronically transfer legislative acts to Congress, rather than only allowing physical copies be transferred. The challenge and barriers created by this current requirement were clearly exposed during both the recent COVID pandemic restrictions as well as the Capitol campus restrictions following the January 6, 2021 attacks on the Capitol.

The other 13 measures that have been shared with us would do direct and serious harm to the District of Columbia and we urge you to reject these measures completely. These bills represent an unprecedented attack on the autonomy and home rule of our local government and the more than 700,000 Americans that call it home. The breadth of these bills is remarkable, and if passed, would result in an erosion of accountability and public safety for the District of Columbia. They range from eliminating and replacing our elected and accountable Attorney General for the District of Columbia with a President's hand-picked and unaccountable associate requiring no confirmation by the U.S. Senate and no local ties, to a full repeal of multiple local DC laws that have been in place for many years, if not decades, that are tested, proven, and effective components of our public safety infrastructure and ecosystem. The effect of these Congressional repeals would put our legal and Court system into chaos and directly undermine successful tools that focus on serious accountability and effective rehabilitation when a crime occurs. As always, when revisions or amendments to DC laws are necessary, those changes should only take place within our local legislature which has the best capacity to provide effective oversight and accountable actions for the residents of the District of Columbia.

We respectfully request that all members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and all members of Congress, reject these harmful measures whether in committee mark up or before the full House of Representatives. Given the breadth of the multiple measures before you, we also request an opportunity to provide a more in-depth discussion of each bill before the Committee's mark-up, especially in light that the Committee will not hold public hearings on these measures.

Sincerely,

Chairman Phil Mendelson; Councilmember Anita Bonds, At-Large; Councilmember Robert White, Jr., At-Large; Councilmember Brooke Pinto, Ward 2; Councilmember Janeese Lewis George, Ward 4; Councilmember Charles Allen, Ward 6; Councilmember Trayon White, Sr., Ward 8; Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, At-Large;

Councilmember Christina Henderson, At-Large; Councilmember Brianne Nadeau, Ward 1; Councilmember Matthew Frumin, Ward 3; Councilmember Zachary Parker, Ward 5; Councilmember Wendell Felder, Ward 7.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is scheduled to markup fourteen bills tomorrow related to the operations of the District of Columbia. With the exception of H.R. 2693, the District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal Act, I write in strong opposition to these bills. They address inherently local issues and laws that were passed after careful consideration by the District's elected representatives, who are directly accountable to District residents. Members of this very Committee have long advocated for the principles of federalism on which this nation was founded. They have consistently condemned federal overreach and fought forcefully and convincingly for the uniquely American values of local control, freedom, and self-governance. These principles should apply to the more than 700,000 people who call Washington, DC home, just as they do for your constituents across the country.

I specifically want to call attention to the significant incursion on local self-governance reflected in two bills, the District of Columbia Attorney General Appointment Reform Act and the District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act. Both laws would displace the ability of District residents to have a voice in the selection of local leaders who wield significant power over local judicial matters: the judges on our local courts and the Attorney General for the District. The judges on the DC Court of Appeals and DC Superior Court rule on inherently local matters such as criminal prosecutions, landlord-tenant cases, probate proceedings, civil cases, and divorce proceedings, all of which have profoundly important impact on our community. For more than 50 years, the Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC) has successfully allowed DC residents to have a voice in judicial appointments, while also granting the President and Senate a role in confirming our judges. I urge the Committee not to overturn that well-established process.

The DC Attorney General, as the District's chief law officer, is also responsible for local legal issues, namely, protecting the District and its residents in a wide range of matters, such as enforcing child support laws, handling abuse and neglect proceedings in the child welfare system, enforcing our housing code, and defending District agencies and officers when they are sued. In no other place in the United States are such local issues determined by a federally appointed person with no local accountability. The proposed legislation would be especially undemocratic in light of the fact that, in 2010, an overwhelming majority of District voters (76 percent) exercised their right to amend the District Charter to make the DC Attorney General an independent, elected office, rather than a position appointed by and subordinate to the Mayor. With that vote, District residents clearly expressed their desire that the Attorney General should be independent and

accountable to them. The pending bill would displace that choice in favor of installing an Attorney General accountable not to District residents, but to the President. Given that the U.S. Attorney for the District is already appointed by the President, if passed, this bill would concentrate all criminal and civil litigation authority in the President, divesting the District and its residents of any local control over these essential functions.

No one knows or cares more about keeping DC safe than DC residents who work, live and raise their families here. Our democratically elected officials work closely with local law enforcement, policy experts, and community leadership to pass laws that are in the best interests of all Washingtonians. Substituting the will of DC voters with the whim of federal politicians is undemocratic and un-American.

I urge you to reject these measures and uphold the values Congress sought to advance more than 50 years ago when it passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: that District residents should enjoy the "powers of local self-government" that all other Americans enjoy. See DC Code §1-201.02.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the D.C. local legislature, the Council, has 13 members. If D.C. residents do not like how members vote, residents can vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. That is called democracy.

Congress has 535 voting Members. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how Members vote on local D.C. matters, residents cannot vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. This is the antithesis of democracy.

The substance of this bill is irrelevant since there is never justification for Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters. Nevertheless, I will discuss it.

□ 1250

Vehicular pursuits by police officers are inherently dangerous not just for officers and suspects but for bystanders, too, and often there are other options to detain a suspect. D.C. permits vehicular pursuits, but it imposes limitations on them. According to the International Association of Chiefs of Police, vehicular pursuit policies must "balance the risks, take all of the factors into consideration, and reach a decision that is best suited to their jurisdictions." Unlike D.C., 2 percent of local police departments prohibit vehicular pursuits altogether. The sponsor of this bill, who is from Louisiana, thinks he knows better than D.C. how to strike the proper balance in D.C.

I will read for my Republican colleagues part of the signing statement your fellow Republican, President Richard Nixon, issued on the D.C. Home Rule Act: "One of the major goals of this administration is to place responsibility for local functions under local control and to provide local governments with the authority and resources they need to serve their communities effectively. The measure I sign today represents a significant step

in achieving this goal in the city of Washington. It will give the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect their own city officials and to govern themselves in local affairs. As the Nation approaches the 200th anniversary of its founding, it is particularly appropriate to assure those persons who live in our Capital City rights and privileges which have long been enjoyed by most of their countrymen."

D.C. residents have all the obligations of American citizenship, including paying Federal taxes, serving on juries, and registering with the Selective Service, yet Congress denies them full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. The only solution to this undemocratic treatment is to grant D.C. statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter explaining why the D.C. statehood bill is constitutional from leading constitutional scholars, including Larry Tribe.

MAY 22, 2021.

Re Washington, D.C. Admission Act, H.R. 51 and S. 51 (the "D.C. Admission Act").

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. KEVIN O. McCARTHY,
*Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
*Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS: As scholars of the United States Constitution, we write to correct claims that the D.C. Admission Act is vulnerable to a constitutional challenge in the courts. For the reasons set forth below, there is no constitutional barrier to the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth (the "Commonwealth") entering the Union through a congressional joint resolution, pursuant to the Constitution's Admissions Clause, just like the 37 other states that have been admitted since the Constitution was adopted. Furthermore, Congress's exercise of its express constitutional authority to decide to admit a new state is a classic political question, which courts are highly unlikely to interfere with, let alone attempt to bar.

The D.C. Admission Act. The House passed the Act, as H.R. 51, on April 22, 2021, and as of this writing, the substantively identical companion bill (S. 51) is under consideration by the Senate. The Act provides for the issuance of a congressional joint resolution declaring the admittance as a State of most of the territory currently comprising the District of Columbia, while the seat of government (defined as the "Capital") will fall outside of the boundaries of the new State and remain under federal jurisdiction. The Act also repeals the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress's authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment; and provides for expedited consideration of the repeal of that Amendment.

The Admissions Clause grants Congress constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. The starting point for a constitutional analysis of the Act is the Constitution's Admissions Clause (Art. IV, Sect. 3), which provides that "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this

Union." The Clause "vests in Congress the essential and discretionary authority to admit new states into the Union by whatever means it considers appropriate as long as such means are framed within its vested powers." Every State admitted into the Union since the Constitution was adopted has been admitted by congressional action pursuant to this Clause; no State has been admitted pursuant to a constitutional amendment.

The Supreme Court has broadly construed Congress's assigned power to admit new states and has never interfered with Congress's admission of a state, even when potentially legitimate constitutional objections existed. For example, in 1863, Congress admitted into the Union West Virginia, which had been part of the State of Virginia, in potential violation of a provision of the Admissions Clause that bars the formation of a new State out of a portion of the territory of another State without the consent of the ceding State. The Supreme Court, however, did not bar West Virginia's admission; to the contrary, it later tacitly approved of it.

Some critics of the D.C. Admission Act have suggested that Maryland's consent might be required under the foregoing provision of the Admissions Clause. This objection mistakenly presupposes that Maryland retains a reversionary interest in the territory currently composing the District of Columbia, which Maryland ceded to the federal government when the District was established in 1791. In fact, Maryland expressly relinquished all sovereign authority over the territory at issue when the federal government accepted it. The express terms of the cession state that the territory was "for ever ceded and relinquished to the congress and government of the United States, in full and absolute right, and exclusive jurisdiction" As Viet D. Dinh, who served as an Assistant Attorney General during the presidency of George W. Bush, has explained, because Maryland's cession of the territory now constituting the District was full and complete, it severed D.C. residents' now far distant "political link with" Maryland. The current District is not part of Maryland, and Maryland has no claim on any portion of the District's territory. There is accordingly no basis to require Maryland's consent for the establishment of the new State.

The Constitution's District Clause poses no barrier to admitting the Commonwealth into the Union. The Constitution's District Clause grants Congress power to "exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States." Based on this Clause, Congress established the current District of Columbia, which (as explained) was taken from territory ceded by Maryland, as well as Virginia.

The D.C. Admission Act complies with the District Clause because it provides that the Capital—which is defined in the Act to include (among other things) the White House, the Capitol Building, the United States Supreme Court Building, and the Federal executive, legislative, and judicial office buildings located adjacent to the Mall—will not become part of the new State and will remain under the sovereignty of the federal government.

Some critics have argued that the District Clause somehow mandates that the District of Columbia permanently retain all of its current territory, and that its size may neither be increased or reduced by Congress. The plain language of the District Clause says no such thing; it does not mandate that

the District be any size or shape, except it limits the maximum size of the federal enclave to ten square miles.

Historical practice confirms that Congress can change the size of the District. In 1791, Congress altered the District's southern boundary to encompass portions of what are now Alexandria, Virginia and Anacostia. Then, in 1846, Congress retroceded Alexandria and its environs back to Virginia. As a result, the territory composing the District was reduced by a third.

At the time of the 1846 retrocession, the House's Committee on the District of Columbia considered, and rejected, the very argument that critics of the D.C. Admission Act are raising today, reasoning that the "true construction of [the District Clause] would seem to be solely that Congress retain and exercise exclusive jurisdiction" over territory comprising the "seat of government." The language of the District Clause, the legislators observed, places no mandate on the size, or even the location, of that seat of government, other than preventing the government from "hold[ing] more than ten miles for this purpose." The House's judgment was correct in 1846, and remains so today.

The Twenty-Third Amendment does not prevent Congress from granting the Commonwealth statehood. Opponents of statehood have suggested that the Twenty-Third Amendment bars Congress from exercising its constitutionally enumerated authority to grant statehood to the Commonwealth. In fact, the Amendment poses no barrier to the admission of the Commonwealth into the Union through an act of Congress, in accordance with the plain language of the Admissions Clause, just as Congress has done in connection with the admission of several other States, including most recently Alaska and Hawaii.

Section 1 of the Twenty-Third Amendment, which was ratified in 1961, provides:

The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct: A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State.

By its plain terms, the Amendment poses no barrier to Congress's admission of the Commonwealth into the Union. Indeed, it is entirely silent on the matter.

The only question raised by the existence of the Twenty-Third Amendment is a practical, not a constitutional one: How best to address the Twenty-Third Amendment's provision for the assignment of presidential electors to what will become a vestigial seat of government, with virtually no residents? The Act satisfactorily addresses this question by providing for the repeal of the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress's authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment, as well as by commencing the process for repealing the Amendment itself.

Initially, the Act provides for an expedited process for repeal of the Twenty-Third Amendment, a process that should move forward to ratification swiftly and successfully once the Commonwealth is admitted as a State. None of the other 50 States has reason to seek to retain three electors for a largely unoccupied seat of government.

But the Act also addresses the possibility that the Twenty-Third Amendment is not

promptly repealed by mandating the immediate repeal of the provision of federal law that provides the current mechanism for District residents to participate in federal elections.

In 1961, following the adoption of the Twenty-Third Amendment, Congress exercised its enforcement authority by enacting legislation (codified at 3 U.S.C. §21), providing that the District residents may select presidential electors; the votes of the electors are currently awarded to the ticket prevailing in the District's presidential election.

The existing statutes fall within the broad authority granted to Congress by the Twenty-Third Amendment to define the terms of, and effectuate, the District's participation in presidential elections. The Amendment allows for the appointment of a number of Electors "in such manner as the Congress may direct." The Amendment also allows Congress to select the number of Electors the District may receive, subject only to a maximum: The District may participate in the presidential Electoral College through the appointment of no more electors than those of the smallest State, i.e., three. And section 2 of the Amendment grants Congress the power to "enforce" the provision "by appropriate legislation," as it did in 1961.

But once Congress acts again, pursuant to its express grant of constitutional authority, and repeals the legislation that creates the existing procedure for District residents to select presidential electors, that will remove the legislative provision providing for the District's participation in presidential elections. Without such a provision, there is no mechanism for identifying the Capital area's electors or allocating their votes.

Some scholars have questioned whether that approach is satisfactory. They contend that the Twenty-Third Amendment is self-enforcing, and effectively mandates the appointment of electors on behalf of the District of Columbia, regardless of whether such appointment is called for under a federal statute. Some of us disagree; indeed, the very existence of Section 2 of the Amendment makes clear that enabling legislation is required to effectuate the District's participation in the presidential election process. And Congress's 1961 enforcement legislation supports this interpretation.

Even if this self-enforcement argument were to be accepted, however, Congress could easily address it by replacing the current law mandating that the Capital area's electors vote in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District with a new legislative mandate that the Capital area's electors vote in other ways. For example, Congress could require District electors to vote in favor of the presidential ticket that receives the most Electoral College votes (of the remaining 538 electors). Or, alternatively, Congress could require that District electors vote for the winner of the national popular vote winner.

A recent Supreme Court decision confirms that a legislative directive to the Capital area's electors would be enforceable. The Twenty-Third Amendment provides that the District "shall appoint" electors "in such manner as Congress may direct"; this language is a direct parallel to the Constitution's grant of broad authority to each of the States to appoint and instruct their respective electors. In its recent decision in *Chiafalo v. Washington*, the Supreme Court held that electors do not have discretion to decide how to cast their Electoral College votes, but rather are legally bound to follow the instructions given by their respective states.

As Columbia Law School Professors Jessica Bulman-Pozen and Olatunde Johnson

have observed, it follows from the Court's holding in *Chiafalo* that Congress could legally bind any electors to vote in accordance with the overall vote of the Electoral College or the national popular vote, just as the existing enabling statute currently binds them to vote in the Electoral College in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District.

In sum, none of the critics' constitutional objections to the D.C. Admission Act are meritorious; and the contention that a constitutional amendment is required to admit the Commonwealth into the Union is incorrect. The D.C. Admission Act calls for a proper exercise of Congress' express authority under the Constitution to admit new states, a power that it has exercised 37 other times since the Constitution was adopted.

Courts are unlikely to second-guess Congress's exercise of its constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. Apart from the fact that the legal objections to admission of the Commonwealth as a State are without merit, it is also unlikely that the courts will ever consider those objections. As Mr. Dinh has observed, the decision whether to admit a state into the Union is a paradigmatic political question that the Constitution expressly and exclusively assigns to Congress. The Supreme Court has long, and strenuously, avoided adjudicating disputes respecting matters that the Constitution makes the sole responsibility of the coordinate, elected branches.

The remaining objections to Statehood do not concern applicable constitutional law, but rather matters of policy.

For example, some have argued that the District should not be admitted to the Union because it is a single city and have instead proposed that most of the District's territory be retrocessioned to Maryland. There is, however, no constitutional barrier to a large, diverse city, with a population comparable to that of several existing States, joining the Union. Furthermore, the Maryland retrocession proposal is subject to many of the same supposed constitutional objections raised by those who object to statehood for the District. For example, retroceding the District to Maryland would decrease the size of the remaining federal enclave, which objectors to District Statehood have claimed is constitutionally impermissible. A forced merger of the District and Maryland would also do nothing to address the purported constitutional objection to leaving the residual seat of government with three potential electors, pursuant to the terms of the Twenty-Third Amendment, prior to the Amendment's repeal.

Opponents also argue that Congress should not grant the District statehood because it will lead to a lawsuit. But any court challenge will be without merit, and indeed likely will be dismissed as presenting a political question. We respectfully submit that Congress should not avoid exercising its express constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union because of meritless threats of litigation.

Sincerely yours,

Caroline Fredrickson, Georgetown University Law Center; Erwin Chemerinsky, University of California, Berkeley School of Law; Stephen I. Vladeck, University of Texas Law School; Franita Tolson, University of Southern California, Gould School of Law; Jessica Bulman-Pozen, Columbia Law School; Leah Litman, University of Michigan Law School; Laurence H. Tribe, Harvard Law School; Paul Smith, Georgetown University Law Center; Geoffrey R. Stone, University of Chicago Law School; Peter Edelman, Georgetown University Law Center; Kermit Roosevelt, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School; Eric Segall,

Georgia State College of Law; Trevor Potter, Campaign Legal Center.

Gregory P. Downs, University of California, Davis; Larry Sabato, University of Virginia; Aziz Huq, University of Chicago Law School; Jennifer Hochschild, Harvard University; Neil S. Siegel, Duke University School of Law; Beau Breslin, Skidmore College; David C. Vladeck, Georgetown University Law Center; Sanford Levinson, University of Texas at Austin School of Law; Ira C. Lupu, George Washington University Law School; Peter M. Shane, Ohio State University Moritz College of Law; Ira P. Robbins, American University Washington College of Law; Michael Greenberger, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law; David Pozen, Columbia Law School.

Mark Tushnet, Harvard Law School; Michael C. Dorf, Cornell Law School; Miguel Schor, Drake University School of Law; David S. Schwartz, University of Wisconsin Law School; Caroline Mala Corbin, University of Miami School of Law; Jonathan Askin, Brooklyn Law School; Aziz Rana, Cornell Law School; John Mikhail, Georgetown University Law Center; Richard Ford, Stanford Law School; Richard Primus, University of Michigan Law School; Joseph Fishkin, University of Texas Law School; Kate Masur, Northwestern University; Chris Edelson, American University.

Ms. NORTON. The D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, grants D.C. residents full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. H.R. 51 reduces the size of the Federal District from 68 square miles to 2 square miles, consisting of the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, The National Mall and remaining under the control of Congress.

The new State consists of the residential and commercial areas of D.C. The new State has a larger population than two States, pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State, and pays more total Federal taxes than 21 States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "no" on the D.C. Policing Protection Act, keep their hands off D.C. and free D.C.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Representative MIN that clarifies that he meant to vote "yes" on H.R. 5143 in committee.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2025.
Chairman JAMES COMER,
House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER: I am writing to respectfully clarify my intent regarding a vote I cast during the House Oversight and Government Reform full committee markup held on September 10, 2025. Because of miscommunication during the evening vote series, my recorded vote on H.R. 5143, the *District of Columbia Policing Protection Act*, does not reflect my intended position.

For the record, I meant to vote "Aye" on the final passage H.R. 5143, which repeals restrictions on the circumstances under which law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia may engage in vehicular pursuits. I ask that this letter be included in the committee's official record to reflect my intent.

Thank you for your understanding.

Sincerely,

DAVE MIN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. McIVER).

Mrs. McIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep concern for our Nation's Capital, also known as chocolate city.

The four Republican bills on the floor this week are a direct attack on the people of this city, particularly the Black and Brown communities who have called D.C. home for generations.

These are residents who have built thriving small businesses, who have received an education from the D.C. school system, residents who have raised families and who call themselves proud Washingtonians since birth.

This bill, H.R. 5143, would impose the President's twisted vision of justice on D.C., overriding the autonomy of this city and hurting the people who live here.

Enabling deadly vehicle pursuits of suspects in the city, as a former councilwoman and a council president of the largest city in New Jersey, I know firsthand that this is dangerous. That is on top of the other bills that we are debating this week that seek to strip D.C. of its autonomy, force more juveniles into the justice system, expand the President's gross overreach, and make things worse.

The bills proposed by my Republican colleagues will worsen the already rampant injustices we see in the criminal justice system, make law enforcement more dangerous, and steal the futures of many of our youth.

These bills all send the same statement to Washingtonians: The administration does not believe you have the same right to dignity as other parts of this Nation.

If Congress truly wants to make our Nation's Capital as safe as it can be, we would listen to the residents of D.C. and their elected leaders who have lived experiences of what this community needs. The dog whistles used to justify these bills are not true. The D.C. Government has long taken a proactive approach to reducing crime in the District and today is experiencing a three-decade low in crime.

D.C. has done this in part by having a police force that looks like the very people it is sworn to protect, lives in the community it serves, and caters to the unique needs of D.C. residents.

The Speaker pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. McIVER. H.R. 5143 discourages basic public safety, pushes lies about crime in the Black and Brown communities, and puts everyone in harm's way and at risk.

That is why it is no surprise of who the sponsor is of this very dangerous and wicked bill. This bill is dangerous, once again, and a complete disaster to this community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, let me just diplomatically address a couple of the accusations here regarding the nature of my bill.

The gentlewoman acknowledged that there is danger involved, yes. Yes, enforcing the law is dangerous. This is why the professional law enforcement officers across the country, including here in D.C., are incredibly well vetted and trained and equipped to make decisions in a matter of seconds or less to pursue criminals and to enforce the law.

It is dangerous work. It is dangerous for the officer. It can result in injury or death for the criminal. It can result in injury or death for innocent Americans, but let us never forget that the interaction was initiated by the criminal. Mr. Speaker, enforcing the law is dangerous work.

What is more dangerous, Mr. Speaker, is failure to enforce the law. What is more dangerous for every community, including our Nation's Capital, for which this body has a responsibility to stand, is failure to give discretion for enforcement of law to the very law enforcement professionals that you have trained and equipped and placed on the streets. To not allow those professionals to make decisions and enforce a law, that is incredibly dangerous.

My bill stands on the side of the citizenry of D.C. in an effort to enforce the law by fully empowering the police officers of D.C. to engage criminal conduct and enforce the law.

□ 1300

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY).

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's bill.

I appreciate my colleague from Louisiana. We have had a chance to serve together on committees. I know he has a strong respect for law enforcement, so I am not saying his heart is in the wrong place, but I am saying this bill is wrong. I say that from personal experience.

He is right, I was never in an active car pursuit, but I was a prosecutor here in Washington, D.C., and for 8 years in Prince George's County, which is the eastern border of Washington, D.C., so I have seen the results of some of these high-speed chases.

The bill that is drafted, that he has proposed, actually takes away a reasonable balance that was drawn by the people here of the District of Columbia, as is their right for a democracy.

Also, one of the things we need to keep in mind, and my colleague addressed this kind of briefly but, frankly, skipped over it, what happens when

that chase leads to the death of innocent civilians?

When the gentleman said he had been in 100 car chases, a chill went through my body, I have to say, because I have seen the results, the deadly consequences of some of these car chases. When you have to go talk to that family and tell them why their loved ones died, you don't want to have to say that it was over something minor like a stolen car.

The balance that the city struck was that it should be for an imminent violent offense, high-level felony, something like that that you really understand why they would have engaged in the pursuit. This bill would take that away and expand it open so that you could have high-speed chases taking place with respect to misdemeanors.

This isn't a hypothetical for me. When I was the State's attorney in Prince George's County, we actually had one of these. We had several, but I will just pick one for purposes of time. A police officer saw a stolen motorcycle zip down the beltway and decided to pursue it. Stealing a motorcycle is a misdemeanor and speeding is a misdemeanor, but he decided to pursue it anyway.

Mind you, this is during rush hour, so he had to pursue on the border of the road, and speeds got up to over 100 miles an hour on the beltway in rush hour. Of course, it is hard for a car to catch a motorcycle, especially when it can weave in and out of traffic.

He didn't make the apprehension, but what he did do as he was speeding along on the side of the road at 100-plus miles an hour was come across debris on the road, and he tried to swerve to avoid it. When he did that, the car jumped over the Jersey barrier between the two lanes and took him into the opposite lane of oncoming traffic.

The car jumped over, hit the top of a car coming the opposite direction, and killed two men on their way to a concert. They had nothing to do with any kind of high-speed chase. They didn't have anything to do with any kind of criminal activity. These were people who were good folks, actually just visiting in the area—one was from Buffalo—who died because of a high-speed chase over a minor misdemeanor. That doesn't make any sense. It is not like that only happens in Prince George's County.

Here in Washington, D.C., we had a similar kind of case. It was back in 2016. It led up to a deadly chase on East Capitol and Benning Road. The chases the gentleman was talking about, maybe those were rural areas, but those are high-traffic areas even in the nighttime. Sometimes these pursuits take place during the day.

This led to the death of an innocent man. This was over a stolen car. Think about what you would say to that family when you are explaining to them that their father, brother, or son lost his life over a stolen car.

Then the other part that influences me—again, I represent Prince George's

County now—but sometimes when they start high-speed chases in D.C., they go into Prince George's County, Montgomery County, or Northern Virginia, and we lost someone during a high-speed chase on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway; another stolen car case.

When we make these decisions about when a chase is permitted or should be permitted or not, we need to keep in mind that there can be deadly consequences from when this happens, and it frequently occurs. It is not like this is unusual. The Washington Post just did a piece about the Park Police. There have been 10 of these instances in recent weeks.

I have a couple last points. One is liability. The Federal Government is going to put this burden on the city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. IVEY. When that liability arises from a car chase ending in death that didn't make any sense to a jury, the city could be on the hook for millions of dollars. I guarantee they are not going to step in and have the Federal Government cover that for them. When we think about these things, we need to keep all of those things in mind.

The last point I will make, a variation on the home rule argument. D.C. is not a rural jurisdiction. In fact, its roads aren't even as straightforward as Manhattan. We have got diagonal roads that cut across, we have circles, and we have very dangerous intersections. I wish my colleagues knew how tricky it can be out there. A high-speed chase in the middle of the District of Columbia, even during the middle of the day is almost, by definition, dangerous almost under any circumstances, so you better have a really good reason to engage in a pursuit like that.

That is not the balance that is drawn by this bill. That is not the balance that was drawn by the people of the District of Columbia. It should be the balance, and they should make the call because when the deaths happen, my colleagues won't be anywhere to be found.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I strongly oppose this bill. D.C.'s elected leaders have set clear, commonsense limits on high-speed chases and limits that save lives. I just remind folks that States like Texas, Florida, and Tennessee recognize the danger and restrict pursuits to violent crimes or imminent deaths, and D.C. follows that same practice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense legislation to allow police offi-

cers in the District of Columbia to pursue and apprehend criminals to keep residents and visitors in the District safe. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5371, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 719, HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHARLES "CHARLIE" JAMES KIRK; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 722 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 722

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5371) making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 719) honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees.

SEC. 3. Sections 9, 10, and 11 of House Resolution 707, agreed to September 16, 2025, are each amended by striking "March 31, 2026" and inserting "January 31, 2026".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 722, providing for the House's consideration of two pieces of legislation.

First, the rule provides for H. Res. 719, Honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk, to be considered under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Second, the rule provides for H.R. 5371, the Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2026. H.R. 5371 would be considered under a closed rule, and it also provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule tolls the day counts until January 31, 2026, regarding joint resolutions terminating the national emergencies declared by the President on February 1, 2025; April 2, 2025; and July 30, 2025.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation, beginning with H. Res. 719, honoring Charlie Kirk.

It is really quite unbelievable that we are here today honoring the life of Charlie Kirk, taken from us far too soon. This is the kind of tribute you would give after a lifetime of service, not usually at the young age of just 31, but Charlie Kirk made a lifetime's worth of impact in his short 31 years on this Earth, and we are grateful for it.

Charlie Kirk was a generational leader and a cultural icon. He was dedicated to engaging young people, defending our constitutional freedoms, and calling on Americans to live with courage and conviction.

Whether you agreed with him or not, he showed up, he listened, and he engaged in respectful dialogue. He never backed down from the belief that ideas should be debated in the open.

Charlie Kirk believed that freedom is worth defending, that faith has a rightful place in the public square, and the next generation deserves leaders who tell the truth and invite honest debate. He believed that every human life had value, even those who vehemently disagreed with him.

What happened last week was evil, but we can't fear it because if we do, then evil wins. Therefore, we will not back down, and we will not allow hatred to intimidate us or to silence our speech.

He leaves behind a loving wife and two children. He was a child of God, a son, a husband, a father, and a conservative leader who, even in death, still inspires millions around the world.

I hope the whole House will join me in praying for Erika and his precious children and the family and friends he leaves behind. May God surround them with love, comfort them with His presence, and provide a peace that surpasses our understanding.

We will never forget Charlie Kirk. Let us carry on his legacy and always defend the ideals he lived out.

I was proud last night to be a member of the Rules Committee, and I thank Ranking Member McGOVERN and the other Democratic members of the committee for recognizing that many of us on this side of the aisle knew Charlie personally. I also thank Representatives DEBBIE DINGELL, TOM SUOZZI, DON DAVIS, JOHN LARSON, JIMMY PANETTA, MARIE GLUESENKAMP PEREZ, and CHRIS PAPPAS, who joined our prayer vigil for Charlie earlier this week.

I was and am glad that we condemned political violence together and were able to share compassion for one another.

Moving on to H.R. 5371, this rule also provides for consideration of the continuing resolution. Passing a continuing resolution is never our first choice, but as Chairman COLE said last night, real progress is being made, and he is encouraged by this year's appropriations process.

The House has already approved 60 percent of government spending, and the Appropriations Committee has finished its work at the committee level. Chairman COLE and every member of the Appropriations Committee deserve credit for the long hours of work that have already been done and the progress that has been made.

Following this good example, under the leadership of Leader THUNE and our Senate Republican colleagues, they have also advanced appropriations

measures on the Senate floor, something Senate Democrats failed to do in the last appropriations cycle when they controlled the Chamber.

Though a CR, a continuing resolution, is not ideal, this year we are further ahead than we have been in a long time. We cannot allow a government shutdown to derail the important work of the Trump administration.

As Chairwoman FOXX said last night, this short-term CR gives our Appropriations colleagues the time they need to keep negotiating and work toward bipartisan funding bills that fulfill our priorities to the American people.

There has been plenty of debate about what is and isn't in the CR, but our priority must be keeping this process moving forward and avoiding the chaos that a government shutdown would create.

If our colleagues on the other side of the aisle really care about our military, about law enforcement, about our Federal workers, they will join us in keeping the government open.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the consideration of these important pieces of legislation, and I urge the passage of this rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1640

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, I think it is important to say that we all condemn the murder that occurred last week in Utah, and I know that some of my colleagues knew Mr. Kirk and are experiencing a personal loss as well. His family is certainly in our prayers, and violence is never ever the answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the CR that is before us today, here is the deal. Republicans have three choices. One is to work with Democrats on a bipartisan CR that ensures millions of Americans don't lose health insurance or see their premiums skyrocket; two is for Republicans to do what Donald Trump said and pass the CR themselves—Republicans are in charge after all; or, three, Republicans can shut down the government.

If they choose door number two or door number three, make no mistake about what will happen. ACA tax credits will expire, and nearly 24 million people will see their premiums skyrocket by 93 percent, on average.

Let me paint a picture. A mom and a dad in their early sixties both have jobs and make \$80,000 a year combined. Right now, they can afford their healthcare—barely. If these ACA credits expire, their bill jumps more than \$17,000 a year. That is like a house mortgage. That is \$1,400 a month, every month, just for the privilege of not going bankrupt if they get sick. Or, take a family of four making \$64,000. Their premiums rise by \$2,600 a year. That is groceries. That is car payments.

It might not sound like a lot of money to my friends on the other side. Maybe the billionaires don't think \$2,600 a year is a lot, but my constituents do, Mr. Speaker. My guess is that millions of Americans will think that is a high cost to pay.

Mr. Speaker, if these tax credits disappear, it is a five-alarm fire, and Republicans are acting like they don't even smell the smoke. Should we be surprised? Of course not.

The American people are already drowning in a cost-of-living crisis, one fueled by Donald Trump and the Republican economic policies. Their big, ugly bill didn't just raise costs for housing, groceries, and utilities. Its cruellest blow was to healthcare.

They made the largest cut to Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act in American history, kicking millions of working people off their coverage. That means hospitals closing, nursing homes shuttering, preventative care denied, and, by the way, families going hungry because food assistance was ripped away, too.

While families are trying to stay afloat, while farmers are struggling with tariffs, and while regular people suffer, Donald Trump decided to take an ax to medical research. He slashed the NIH, shut down cancer research, stopped clinical trials, and torpedoed vaccine programs. I mean, what the hell is wrong with him? What is he thinking?

But don't worry about healthcare. Don't worry about ACA tax credits. We will deal with this later. That is what the Speaker said. Kick the can down the road. Well, guess what. We have reached the end of the road. Later is too late.

The Congressional Budget Office says that if we don't act now and instead wait until December, an additional 1.5 million people will lose their coverage. That is a lot of people. That is a lot of people, I say to my colleagues. That is people in every single city and town in America. Premiums will climb even higher. Families will start getting cancellation notices in weeks, and open enrollment starts November 1. This is something we need to deal with now.

Here is the message to Republicans: Work with us. Fund the government. Protect healthcare. Stop writing bills for the rich and powerful. Start working on solutions to the everyday problems that people have. The choice is yours.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ).

Ms. De La CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding her time.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart. We should not have to debate this legislation this evening. This legislation is the result of a horrific decision to assassinate a man of faith, a husband, a father, and a friend, Charlie Kirk.

My heart aches for his wife, Erika, and their two beautiful children, his loved ones, and all those who looked up to him, including my own two kids. They looked up to Charlie as well. My prayers are with his family and the entire Turning Point community, who lost a leader and a friend.

Charlie was taken from us in a cowardly act while exercising our most sacred American right, the right to free speech. He was sharing his values with young people on campus, inspiring them and debating them at a university, a university that should be a safe place where ideas should be debated, not silenced.

I am absolutely heartbroken over this evil act. I stand with many of my fellow Americans today mourning this deep, deep loss. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this rule and the passage of the resolution to condemn the attack and honor the life of Charlie Kirk.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless the Kirk family and the entire Nation that is mourning this deep loss.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding me her time.

Mr. Speaker, just days ago, Charlie Kirk was assassinated by an act of deranged cowardice. His death was not only the loss of a husband, but a father, and a friend to many. It is also a sobering reminder that the very rights he spent his life defending must never be taken for granted, rights endowed to each of us by our creator and enfranchised by our Constitution.

This resolution officially honors Charlie Kirk's commitment to the constitutional principles of civil discussion and debate between all people of the United States, regardless of political affiliation.

From the beginning of our Nation, freedom of speech has been a foundational liberty for the American people. The architects of our Republic enshrined the right to speak one's mind without fear as a first principle, knowing that if the people were silenced, then every other freedom would be in peril.

Throughout our history, Americans have disagreed fiercely and vigorously about politics, morality, and the course of our Nation, but history shows that responding to words with hatred or violence only sets us back. Instead, generation after generation, we have chosen the harder path: to keep the conversation going and to answer speech we oppose with more speech and with reason, civility, and conviction, rather than be intimidated by violence or dragged down into vengeance.

The Founders placed their faith in the power of truth and discourse. They knew that in a free republic, the solution to false or harmful ideas is to

counter them in the light of public discussion.

As Thomas Jefferson reminded us, "error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." We must hold fast to that principle. We will turn more hearts with calm truth than with angry thunder. We will not let violence intimidate us, and we will not let violence drown out truth.

Every great struggle for justice, every step forward for our Nation, and even its very survival has relied on the ability of courageous voices to speak out and enlighten the people.

Charlie Kirk was more than just a prominent political leader. He was a devoted husband, father, and man of deep convictions. As a father myself, I cannot begin to imagine the pain of such a loss. He leaves behind his beloved wife, Erika, and two amazing young children.

Mr. Speaker, we offer our heartfelt condolences to Erika and those children, and we hope they find comfort and peace in this time of unimaginable grief.

Charlie lived with purpose and a clear understanding of what matters most. He loved his family and pursued truth, and he shared those values boldly with the world. He gave young Americans the courage to believe their voices mattered, that they, too, could take part in shaping the future of this Nation.

Just last week, I sat with students who told me they first found their way into political engagement because of Charlie's example. That is his legacy, not only the words he spoke, but the lives he touched, the movement he built, and the spirit of civic courage he inspired.

Mr. Speaker, let us pray that God bless and receive Charlie Kirk, and may He grant comfort and strength to Erika and their children. May God bless our Nation and unite us against violence, unite us in the fight for free speech and truth. I pray that we lift one another up and resolve to leave our children a brighter future and more free than the one we inherited.

□ 1650

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to talk about what will happen if we defeat the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to strike the sections of yesterday's and today's rules, which together block privileged considerations of measures ending the administration's global tariffs and tariffs on Canada, Mexico, and Brazil.

Speaker JOHNSON and this Republican majority are hell-bent on blocking us from even debating Trump's reckless trade policy, which is driving up costs for consumers, for businesses, and for farmers.

Let's just take this week. On Monday, Republicans voted to block debate

on the tariffs that Trump slapped on Brazilian coffee, beef, and other goods. These are the tariffs that are forcing everyday people to spend more on a cup of coffee in the morning.

I think most Republicans in Congress were too scared of Trump to actually stand up and fight to protect everyday consumers. Then yesterday, Republicans barely passed a rule that blocked votes on all of Trump's illegal tariffs until March 31, 2026. I say "barely" because there were a few Republican holdouts threatening to vote against their party because they know how reckless Trump's trade policies are.

Mr. Speaker, it took only 45 minutes for them to fold. Here is what they reportedly got in return. They got an agreement to create a new trade working group. Really? They got a new working group, I mean, to get a meeting? Are my Republican colleagues aware that the House of Representatives already has a working group on trade? It is called the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade.

These brave rebels also apparently want a provision tucked into today's rule that says votes on tariffs will only be blocked until the end of January instead of March. I mean, wow, what a victory.

If my colleagues object to Donald Trump's trade policy, which is raising costs on everyday Americans right now, I can't for the life of me figure out how they were won over by an agreement to keep his policies in place for at least 4 more months.

President Trump promised to lower prices "on day one," but his disastrous trade war is increasing the prices that Americans are paying for food, gas, and everyday goods.

According to independent estimates, Trump's tariffs are resulting in a \$2,300 tax increase in 2025 for the average American household. The August inflation report, put out by Trump's own Bureau of Labor Statistics, said inflation is increasing at the highest rate since January.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the House Committee on Agriculture, and we are hearing day in and day out from farmers who are being crushed by Trump's erratic trade policies. They are losing markets abroad. Input prices are going up. Farm bankruptcies are up 95 percent this year compared to last.

Back when I was on a farm tour in my own district, a coffee roaster told me tariffs are hurting his business. He and countless others in his position can't wait while House Republicans hide their heads in the sand for another 4 months.

Give us up-or-down votes on Trump's reckless tariffs. Stop hiding. This body, this House of Representatives has a responsibility to do oversight and to vote on whether or not we should have tariffs. It really is disappointing to me that so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have not chosen to step up to the plate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text

of my amendment, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would be willing to sacrifice making a few cheap political points, he might find that we are making bipartisan progress toward the goal that he has set forth. I, for one, am glad the Democrats have finally found a tax they don't like.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we considered a resolution that altered the law by extending the authority of the President to impose tariffs by 6 months, from September 30 until March 31.

I agree with the gentleman that our Constitution entrusts Congress with the power to set tariffs but that that responsibility has unwisely, and perhaps even unconstitutionally, been delegated over the years to the President. I think it is time we did revisit that issue. Yesterday, the Speaker committed personally to two things.

First, he promised that the next rule resolution would reduce the extension of this authority from 6 months to 4 months, expiring on January 31 rather than March 31. The gentleman says that is not soon enough. Some of us would agree. This resolution fulfills that promise.

Second, the Speaker promised to convene a working group within the Republican Conference to establish a clear and coherent congressional policy on the use of tariffs to report before the end of January. This is important because there are increasing signs of tariff-related damage to the economy—the gentleman is absolutely right on that point—and because the courts may be moving to restore the guardrails between the executive and legislative branches with respect to tariffs.

I would hope he would support this resolution and thank the leadership for being responsive to those of us who fervently believe that free trade is an essential foundation of a healthy, growing, and thriving economy.

As Bastiat warned nearly two centuries ago, tariffs, by definition, raise prices and reduce resources. They are a tax. This is the first time I have ever found the Democrats to be in opposition to a tax. I think they will find willing and enthusiastic outliers on our side of the aisle as this discussion moves forward.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that every producer is a consumer. Every consumer is a producer. No producer has ever benefited by scarcer resources. No

consumer has ever benefited by higher prices. Yet this is the bitter fruit of protectionist policy down through the ages.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have a serious and sober discussion on this issue and bring it to a resolution. The Speaker has committed to do this. For that, I thank him, and I suggest that the gentleman across the aisle thank him, too.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just said that these tariffs are harmful to our economy and to working families in this country. He could work with us right now to do something about it. We could bring a bill to the floor. We could bring an amendment to the floor. We can block them. We can stop them.

The gentleman said that he is working in a bipartisan way to try to deal with this issue. It is funny, but this working group that they have all agreed on is just a Republican working group. Democrats are not part of it. It is kind of a crazy way to be bipartisan.

Then he says that he gets this great deal in terms of when we will next be able to have a vote on this stuff. They moved the deadline from the end of March to the end of January. That is 4 months from now.

What will happen in 4 months? I will tell my colleagues what will happen in 4 months. We will get a rule that comes to the floor that will extend the prohibition on us being able to debate any kind of tariff legislation, to be able to have a debate or an up-or-down vote.

All I can say is: Where I come from in Massachusetts, we call that being a cheap date because I don't think we get very much, to be honest. Meanwhile, the American consumer, the American people, will suffer with higher prices as a result of these tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), who will speak on this topic.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question, which includes a detrimental and damaging provision that abdicates, that gives up, and that capitulates Congress' constitutional authority over this administration's disastrous tariff policy.

□ 1700

I think we all know Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of our Constitution clearly states that Congress has purview over foreign commerce. Now, more than ever, with the high prices that Americans are experiencing, our communities, our constituents, and this country, need us. They want us. They demand us to reclaim our constitutional powers over trade and fulfill our responsibilities as a check and as a balance over this executive branch.

This administration's incoherent, inconsistent, and incompetent tariff policy is causing Americans to get

crushed by high prices. These are people and businesses who don't have the margins to survive these tariff policies and who don't have access to the Oval Office to cut a backroom deal for relief. These are people and producers who are having to personally pay the high prices that are directly being affected by the high costs.

The tariffs not only have caused high prices, they have caused uncertainty that has destroyed what was once a strong jobs market. When it comes to manufacturing, it is getting tanked as the costs of inputs are increasing and markets are becoming impossible to predict.

Diplomatically, the President's tariff policy is causing consternation amongst our biggest trading partners and our allies and contributing to diplomatic crises.

Legally, the President's tariffs are hanging by a thread after a Federal court found that their claims of emergency power is dubious at best.

The reality is the President's trade policies that are based on his 40-year fetish with tariffs is bad for Americans. It is bad for American foreign policy, and it is bad for our American Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, for what?

Details of any trade deals remain fuzzy and unenforceable, and there is an unstable dynamic that he is creating in which markets are either swinging wildly or fail to react, expecting the President to chicken out.

Yet, in the 119th Congress, this majority is allowing this President to not just bulldoze over not just the well-being of our constituents, Speaker Johnson is allowing the President to run roughshod over our constitutional authority.

Now, more than ever, with these high prices, our communities and our constituents need us to reclaim these constitutional powers over trade and, yes, live up to our responsibilities as an Article I branch of our government.

It is time to repeal these various tariff powers that Congress has granted the executive branch over the past few decades. I am not just talking about IEEPA, but also the many other sections that we have afforded the President. Mr. Speaker, because of those authorities that the President is using capriciously and whimsically to impose his tariffs, it is causing great damage to our economy, and they are creating a crisis with these high costs that all of us are facing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. That is exactly why Congress, that has purview over trade, should defend that jurisdiction, should defend our independence, and we should defend our duty to the American public. It is our job, and it is our responsibility.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is the least we can do for our country, for this Congress, and for our constituents.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what is more hurtful to working families is unfair trade practices that have undermined the American worker for decades. The tariffs imparted by President Trump are proving necessary to ensure fair trade, protect American workers, and reduce trade deficits by bringing other nations to the negotiating table.

Access to the American economy is a privilege. President Trump is taking decisive action to comprehensively re-negotiate the tariff posture of the United States and the rest of the world for the first time since World War II.

His efforts are focused on achieving global free trade, decoupling developing countries from competitive nations like China, and for national security purposes.

From what we have seen, President Trump is winning.

According to an article from NPR on August 11, tariffs are adding tens of billions of new dollars to Federal revenue, with Treasury bringing in more than \$29 billion in customs and excise taxes, a category that is overwhelmingly tariff revenue. Countries like India, China, and South Korea are among the newest nations across the world flocking to the negotiating table.

This comes on the heels of a successfully negotiated trade deal with President Trump like with the EU, Japan, the U.K., Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam.

President Trump is utilizing all available tools in his pressure campaign to make good on his promises to secure the border, protect our communities, and level the global playing field to ensure fair trade for American producers and the American worker.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentlewoman that that is a lot of words to justify the biggest tax increase on the American people, an average of \$2,300 a year more because of these tariffs.

However, I would just say to the gentlewoman, as well, that if she thinks that these policies are great, if she wants these tariffs to continue, then she shouldn't be afraid to vote for them. Have the debate on the floor and let people vote up or down on them.

I don't understand why that is such a controversial thing to want to advocate for, especially in the House of Representatives where we are supposed to be able to debate important issues. If the majority has the votes, if everybody thinks this is a great policy, then they will all vote "yes," and they continue.

I am glad the gentlewoman brought up the economy because I want to speak about the economy just for a couple of minutes here.

Mr. Speaker, the consequences of Trump's economic policy are being felt

in communities across the country. Prices on fruits and vegetables, meat and poultry, and dairy are all up. They are likely to climb even higher as Trump's tariffs ripple through the supply chain.

President Trump and Republicans promised to reduce grocery prices. Instead, grocery prices spiked at the fastest pace in 3 years last month. They have promised to cut electricity prices in half. Instead, August electricity prices were over 6 percent higher than they were 1 year ago. They promised to reduce inflation. Instead, we saw the largest monthly increase in inflation since January. They promised to create jobs, and instead for the first time in nearly 4 years, the economy lost jobs in June. We lost jobs in June, and job growth has been stagnant for months.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump economy is not working for the American people.

Do you know whom it is working for, Mr. Speaker?

It is working for the millionaires and billionaires who contributed to his campaign.

Hardworking Americans deserve a hell of a lot better than a rigged economy that only works for the ultra-wealthy. People are hurting. Do townhalls, I would say to my Republican friends, and they can hear it firsthand. Go to the grocery store and watch as people are putting items back because the prices have gone up so much.

This is not sustainable. At a minimum, the Republican leadership here should not be afraid of debate and votes. We ought to bring these important items to the floor. We have a constitutional responsibility when it comes to trade and tariffs and to debate and to vote on these items. We ought to bring them to the floor. Let's have a thoughtful debate. Then people can vote accordingly, and then they can defend that vote when they go back to their districts.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit disingenuous to criticize the President on tariffs when every single Democrat voted for the largest tax increase in American history just recently.

In the Working Families Tax Cuts Act under the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, the typical family now, because of House Republicans, is going to get up to \$10,900 in additional take-home pay. Workers will see increased wages up to \$7,200. Households earning less than \$100,000 a year will get a 12 percent tax cut compared to today.

Up to 7.2 million jobs have been protected and created, and 1 million new jobs annually will be created by small businesses. No tax on tips, no tax on overtime, car loan interest relief, and tax relief for seniors will put more money annually into Americans' pockets. Mr. Speaker, that is \$1,300 per tipped worker specifically, and \$1,400 for hourly workers. We lock in and fur-

ther boost the double child tax credit to \$2,200 for more than 40 million American families.

To put it quite simply, we are starting to build the financial future for this country after years of Democrat mismanagement.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the gentlewoman is talking about, but the Yale Budget Lab finds American households could pay \$2,300 more, on average, as a result of the current tariff policy, nearly three times the average roughly \$800 benefit from the OBBBA's new tax provisions in the big, beautiful bill, or whatever they call it. We call it the big, ugly bill, which, by the way, is the most unpopular piece of legislation I think in history.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker?

Don't take my word for it. Talk to regular people. Go to a grocery store. Go to a coffee shop. Do a townhall and talk to people about how they are feeling. They are not feeling good. They are not feeling good, Mr. Speaker. They are going to feel even worse if you don't address the healthcare cliff that we are about to confront.

□ 1710

Mr. Speaker, across the country, children, families, grandparents, small business owners, teachers, and veterans are about to receive the unwelcome news that their healthcare premiums are skyrocketing to record highs. Millions of Americans face an awful decision on the horizon as they sort through their bills and are forced to decide which ones to pay.

Republicans could have spent the summer working with Democrats to reach a bipartisan agreement. Instead, they spent it slashing Medicaid and the ACA by a trillion dollars.

Make no mistake: Republicans are kicking 15 million off their healthcare coverage. Republicans are jeopardizing access to prenatal care. They are cutting NIH's budget and taking food benefits away from families, all basically to help pay for tax cuts to the ultrarich.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 24 million people in this country have health insurance through the Affordable Care Act. With Republican inaction, their premiums will increase by an average of 93 percent. A 60-year-old couple making \$80,000 per year would see their premiums increase by over \$17,000 per year. That is like over \$1,400 per month. A family of four earning \$64,000 will owe an extra \$2,600 in healthcare premiums every year.

Where on Earth are families supposed to find this kind of extra money?

Five million Americans, including 2 million with chronic conditions, will lose their healthcare coverage due to the Affordable Care Act cuts alone, not to mention the 10 million more who will lose coverage due to the already

enacted Medicaid cuts in the Republicans' big, ugly bill.

In each of the districts we represent, Americans will have to choose between paying rent, buying groceries, or affording healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, 26,000 Americans in the gentlewoman's district in Indiana will face higher premiums or lose their healthcare altogether. That is a lot of people. We live in the richest country in the world, and Republicans have no problem forcing families to go without food because healthcare premiums are sky-high. This is crazy. Healthcare ought to be a right in this country. It ought not to be a privilege.

When people lose their healthcare, what do they do? They get their healthcare at emergency rooms. That is the most costly and inefficient form of healthcare.

Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how my Republicans friends can talk to people back home in their districts and somehow justify what they are doing. Do Republicans actually think that denying healthcare coverage is good for someone? Seriously, is that popular in Indiana? Is it popular in any State in this country? This is shameful, Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve better.

Congress must address this healthcare cliff now. When the Speaker of the House says: Oh, well, we will deal with it in December; we will talk about this in December—first, we have no guarantees that they will want to deal with it—but let's push this discussion out to December. December is too late. The crisis is about to occur. We have an opportunity to do something, and we are doing nothing. We are doing nothing. This is so wrong. This is immoral, Mr. Speaker. This cannot be justified. There is no way to be able to explain this back home.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What the American people know, what I hope they know, is that this is a lot of political theater going on today, and I am sorry about it. I really am.

Premiums are high because of ObamaCare. The un-affordable care act did nothing to lower healthcare costs and instead raised costs. Subsidizing the failed policies of the Democratic Party is not a solution. It is a Band-Aid at best, and it perpetuates the problem.

Republicans are focused on fixing healthcare, on reducing costs, on raising reimbursement rates, and reforming the system which Democrats broke in the first place. They are fighting for their constituents against a problem that they created. This is a crisis created by the ObamaCare plan in the first place, and we can't just keep throwing money at the problem. That can't be the only answer. We need to have conversations about how to make these programs work for the American

people, and it is House Republicans that are leading that charge.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MC GOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The central issue right now is healthcare. Let me repeat: Healthcare, healthcare, healthcare.

I love it. I don't know how—I am surprised they didn't blame Bill Clinton. Now we are going back to Obama to blame him for the current crisis in healthcare. Give me a break.

Look at the polling. The ACA is pretty popular. What is not popular is the big, ugly bill that the Republicans passed just a few months ago. People are outraged over the fact that Republicans are cutting Medicaid by a trillion dollars and cutting moneys for NIH. The National Institutes of Health is where we fund research to find cures to diseases and to sicknesses.

You want to save money? Let's find a cure to Alzheimer's. Let's find a cure to Parkinson's disease. Let's find more cures to cancer. That is a way you can save money.

I think what the Republicans are doing right now is they want to say that the Affordable Care Act is not working by defunding it, by dismantling it.

My Republicans friends are doing nothing to address the central issue at hand right now, which is healthcare. People are going to lose their healthcare. People are going to see their premiums skyrocket. All the while, we are trying to help here. We are saying we will work with them and let's address this so people don't suffer.

I mean, the whole point of what we are doing here should be about improving the lives for people we represent, improving the lives of people in this country. An all-out assault against their healthcare is coming down the road, and we can do something about it. We want to work with them to do something about it, and my Republican friends keep on saying: No, we are not interested.

What are my Republican friends interested in? If you look at the big, ugly bill, it is tax cuts for the multimillionaires, tax cuts for multibillionaires, and all these giveaways to the fossil fuel industry. It is like the Republican prescription for healthcare is take two tax cuts and call me in the morning.

The bottom line is a crisis is about to happen in this country. We are right at the cliff, and we can do something about it. We can help our constituents. We are urging them, and we are begging them to work with us so we can address these concerns in healthcare, and we are being told no way, no consultation, no cooperation, no collaboration, no negotiation, no nothing.

Remember, it was Democrats who capped the price of insulin for Medicare. It is Republicans who cut Medicaid by a trillion dollars. That is the difference here.

Again, we ought to be addressing this crisis now before our constituents are

hurt in a way that, quite frankly, they are not prepared for.

They don't even know this is coming. We all know it is coming. There is no excuse to not know what is about to happen. Every major organization—CBO, everybody, the insurance industry—has already told us what is about to happen. My Republican friends are like: No, business as usual. Let's just kick the can down the road. We will fund the government for 7 weeks and no promise of anything.

This is not the way this Congress should be run.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MC GOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, here is the bottom line. Congress must act now to prevent one of the most staggering healthcare premium hikes in history—not in November, not in December, but now.

Let's be honest. Donald Trump and his billionaires he has surrounded himself with won't feel an ounce of this pain. They have got the best doctors on speed dial, concierge care, and private chefs. They don't worry about grocery bills. They don't sit at the kitchen table with a stack of medical bills and wonder which one of them they can afford to pay this month.

Regular people, working families, and seniors on fixed incomes do. That is who Democrats are fighting for: regular people who buy their own food, who worry about the rent, and who pray that the car doesn't break down because they can't handle another bill.

□ 1720

If Members want to stand with the billionaires, by all means, vote for the CR. Let a million people get kicked off of healthcare. It won't impact Members of Congress. We all have great healthcare. Republicans don't have to worry about that.

Guess what. Democrats are not going to stand by and watch while Republicans make healthcare more expensive and less accessible for millions of our friends and neighbors. Stop the cuts and fund the government, or own the shutdown that is coming. Protect people's healthcare, or own the consequences when millions lose their coverage.

That is what the choice is for this Republican-controlled government. Right now, Mr. Speaker, it sure as hell looks like Republicans are choosing to shut it down instead of working to keep people insured.

Again, we live in the richest country in the world. Healthcare ought to be viewed as a fundamental right for people in this country. People shouldn't have to worry about going bankrupt if they get sick.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the top issues on the minds of people all

throughout this country right now. The price of groceries and the price of healthcare are what they are worried about. People are deeply concerned that they are not going to be able to afford both, and they are in for a rude awakening when they start to see their premiums go up this November.

Here is the kicker: This Congress can do something about it. All we need is for our Republican friends to work with us. Let us make the necessary adjustments, and let us protect millions of people from losing their healthcare. Let us protect countless people from seeing their premiums go sky-high.

We can do this. This is solvable. We can do it, but for whatever reason, Republicans are not interested. That is what is particularly sad at this particular point, Mr. Speaker.

Prohibiting health insurance companies from denying coverage because of a person's medical history, that is what Democrats did. We have prohibited health insurance companies from denying coverage because of a person's medical history.

We prohibited health insurance companies from charging sick people more.

We prohibited private health insurance companies from denying coverage because of preexisting medical conditions.

We prohibited health insurance companies from denying coverage to pregnant women.

We prohibited private health insurance companies from charging sick people higher premiums than healthy people.

We required health insurance companies to cover the cost of most preventative services.

We prohibited health insurance companies from setting a lifetime limit.

We gave States the option of expanding their Medicaid programs.

We provided financial help to low- and moderate-income Americans to help them purchase coverage.

We prohibited private health insurance companies from setting an annual limit.

We also allowed young adults to stay on their parents' insurance plans until they were 26.

When we think of helping people with healthcare, that is the kind of stuff that we think of. I mentioned before the capping of the cost of insulin in Medicare. We ought to be making it easier for people to get good, quality healthcare. We ought to make sure that it is more affordable and more accessible, and we are going in the opposite direction under this Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule for a whole bunch of reasons, but mostly because healthcare is important to people in this country, and they are about to get screwed. We have an opportunity to do something, and I regret that under this rule, nothing will be done.

Mr. Speaker, let's defeat this rule. Let's go back to the drawing board.

Let's sit down in a bipartisan way. Let's figure out ways to avert this crisis. Let's do what is right for the American people, not what is right for the big contributors in this country and for the well-off and the well-connected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is pretty straightforward. With respect to the continuing resolution, it is simple. It is a clean, short-term continuing resolution to prevent disruptions to national security and programs that our constituents depend on. It is a bill that extends government funding until November 21.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to argue and insist that a healthcare discussion is inserted into this, but that is not a debate for a September funding matter. They are really trying to insert unrelated matters into the middle of a clean government extension.

I don't think that is going to work because if the government shuts down because they are making this last stand, which is something that we will be addressing in the future, it will solely be blamed on Democrats if the government shuts down because we are not playing politics with this at all. We are just trying to keep the lights on.

What they are trying to do is insert a last-ditch effort to regain their footing because their party is reeling right now.

Mr. Speaker, this clean extension of government funding will ensure that the government remains open and working for the Nation. It shouldn't be partisan. If Democrats force a shutdown, it could cost the American taxpayer billions due to back-paid furloughed workers, increased costs from delayed starts, and constrained economic growth.

No matter how hard the Democrats try to characterize this CR as a partisan maneuver, always claiming that we are hurting every special interest group, it doesn't make it true.

Remember, virtually every single House Democrat for the last 4 years under the Biden administration voted "yes" on every continuing resolution. In fact, over the last several years, many Democrats, including Democratic leaders, have made comments about the harm a government shutdown would cause.

The minority leader says it is about the harm. Families will be hurt. Farmers will be hurt if the government shuts down. Others have said: Let's take a moment to see what is truly at the center of this story. It is about the servicemembers who will work without a paycheck.

Some House Democrats accused House Republicans of leading the country toward a reckless government shutdown that will take food off the table for mothers and children and force servicemembers to work without pay.

Make no mistake, if Democrats vote against this simple government funding bill that will extend funding to November 21, they are the very people who are hurting those whom they have claimed that Republicans have perpetually tried to hurt, unfairly and untruly.

Mr. Speaker, again, this rule is straightforward.

First and foremost, we are here to honor the life of a husband, father, and friend. Charlie Kirk was a proud American and a happy warrior for his faith and this country that he loved. Charlie was the kind of person who inspired millions to engage in our democracy. It is right that we take the time as a body to honor him and condemn political violence in all forms.

Finally and secondly, we must keep the government open and allow the appropriations process to continue. While CRs, continuing resolutions, are never ideal and, by definition, are not all-encompassing, if we are truly to address the many issues before this body as a country, we cannot do that under a government shutdown. We must let the appropriations process continue.

I look forward to moving these bills out of the House this week, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. MANNION. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to unequivocally condemn the act of political violence that ended the life of Charlie Kirk. Violence has no place in our democracy, and no American, regardless of political beliefs, should ever be the target of an assassination.

I send my sincere condolences to his wife Erica, his children, and all who mourn his loss.

But condemning violence is not the same as endorsing a legacy. In fact, it is a sign of the strength of our republic that we can both mourn Mr. Kirk's death and openly acknowledge that he was a polarizing figure in American politics. Many Americans justifiably find his words and actions divisive and offensive.

It is entirely legitimate to say that Mr. Kirk's legacy is controversial. To present his life and work in only heroic terms fails to acknowledge his promotion of misinformation and the harmful impact his words have had on marginalized communities. Having these conversations openly, without fear of recrimination or harassment is part of what it means to live in a free society.

As we condemn political violence in the strongest possible terms, let us also reaffirm our commitment to honest debate, to teaching the totality of our history, and to preserving a democracy where it is safe to disagree.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 722 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike section 3 and add the following:
SEC. 3. House Resolution 707, agreed to September 16, 2025, is amended by striking sections 9, 10, and 11.

Mrs. HOUCHEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 210, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Gimenez	Miller (OH)
Alford	Goldman (TX)	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks
Amodei (NV)	Gooden	Mills
Arrington	Gosar	Moolenaar
Babin	Graves	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Greene (GA)	Moore (NC)
Baird	Griffith	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Grothman	Moore (WV)
Barr	Guest	Moran
Barrett	Guthrie	Murphy
Baumgartner	Hageman	Nehls
Bean (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Newhouse
Beginch	Haridopolos	Norman
Bentz	Harrigan	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Harris (MD)	Obernolte
Bice	Harris (NC)	Ogles
Biggs (AZ)	Harshbarger	Onder
Biggs (SC)	Hern (OK)	Owens
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Boebert	Hill (AR)	Patronis
Bost	Hinson	Perry
Brecheen	Houchin	Pfluger
Bresnahan	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Hunt	Rogers (KY)
Burlison	Hurd (CO)	Rouzer
Calvert	Issa	Rouzer
Cammack	Jack	Roy
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rulli
Carter (GA)	James	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Schmidt
Cline	Jordan	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cole	Kean	Sessions
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Shreve
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Crane	Kennedy (UT)	Smith (MO)
Crank	Kigggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Davidson	Kim	Smucker
De La Cruz	Knott	Spartz
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Stauber
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Stefanik
Donalds	LaLota	Steil
Downing	LaMalfa	Steube
Dunn (FL)	Langworthy	Strong
Edwards	Latta	Stutzman
Ellzey	Lawler	Taylor
Emmer	Lee (FL)	Tenney
Estes	Letlow	Thompson (PA)
Evans (CO)	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Ezell	Lucas	Timmons
Fallon	Luna	Turner (OH)
Fedorachak	Luttrell	Valadao
Feenstra	Mace	Van Drew
Fine	Mackenzie	Van Duyne
Finstad	Malliotakis	Van Orden
Fischbach	Maloy	Wagner
Fitzgerald	Mann	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McCaull	Webster (FL)
Flood	McClain	Westerman
Fong	McClintock	Wied
Foxx	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott	McDowell	Wilson (SC)
Fry	McGuire	Wittman
Fulcher	Messmer	Womack
Garbarino	Meuser	Yakym
Gill (TX)	Miller (IL)	Zinke

NOES—210

Adams	Boyle (PA)	Cherfilus-McCormick
Aguilar	Brown	Cormick
Amo	Brownley	Chu
Ansari	Budzinski	Cisneros
Auchincloss	Bynum	Clark (MA)
Balint	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Barragán	Carson	Cleaver
Beatty	Carter (LA)	Clyburn
Bell	Case	Cohen
Bera	Casten	Conaway
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Correa
Bishop	Castro (TX)	Craig

Crockett	Kennedy (NY)	Ramirez
Crow	Khanna	Randall
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin
Davids (KS)	Landsman	Riley (NY)
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Rivas
Davis (NC)	Larson (CT)	Ross
Dean (PA)	Latimer	Ruiz
DeGette	Lee (NV)	Ryan
DeLauro	Lee (PA)	Salinas
DelBene	Leger Fernandez	Sánchez
Deluzio	Levin	Scanlon
DeSaulnier	Liccardo	Schakowsky
Dexter	Lieu	Schneider
Dingell	Lofgren	Scholten
Doggett	Lynch	Schrier
Elfreth	Magaziner	Scott (VA)
Escobar	Mannion	Scott, David
Espaillat	Matsui	Sewell
Evans (PA)	McBath	Sherman
Fields	McBride	Sherill
McClain Delaney	McClellan	Simon
Figueroa	Fletcher	Smith (WA)
Foster	McCollum	Sorenson
Foushee	McDonald Rivet	Soto
Frankel, Lois	McGarvey	Stansbury
Friedman	McGovern	Stanton
McIver	McGovern	Takano
McLanahan	McIver	Thanedar
Min	McLellan	Thompson (CA)
Swalwell	McLellan	Thompson (MS)
Sykes	McLellan	Tokuda
Bost	McLellan	Tonko
Bergman	McLellan	Cammack
Bice	McLellan	Torres (CA)
Brennan	McLellan	Torres (NY)
Brown	McLellan	Trahan
Burkett	McLellan	Carter (TX)
Hunt	McLellan	Johnson (LA)
McLellan	McLellan	Johnson (SD)
Min	McLellan	Schmidt
Swalwell	McLellan	Jordan
Bost	McLellan	Schweikert
Hinson	McLellan	Scott, Austin
Perry	McLellan	Self
Gomez	McLellan	Kean
Thompson	McLellan	Sessions
Thompson	McLellan	Shreve
Thompson	McLellan	Simpson
Thompson	McLellan	Smith (MO)
Thompson	McLellan	Smith (NE)
Thompson	McLellan	Smith (NJ)
Thompson	McLellan	Smith (NJ)
Thompson	McLellan	Smucker
Thompson	McLellan	Spartz
Thompson	McLellan	Stauber
Thompson	McLellan	Stefanik
Thompson	McLellan	Steil
Thompson	McLellan	LaMalfa
Thompson	McLellan	Steube
Thompson	McLellan	Strong
Thompson	McLellan	Stutzman
Thompson	McLellan	Taylor
Thompson	McLellan	Tenney
Thompson	McLellan	Thompson (PA)
Thompson	McLellan	Tiffany
Thompson	McLellan	Timmons
Thompson	McLellan	Turner (OH)
Thompson	McLellan	Valadao
Thompson	McLellan	Van Drew
Thompson	McLellan	Van Duyne
Thompson	McLellan	Van Orden
Thompson	McLellan	Wagner
Thompson	McLellan	Walberg
Thompson	McLellan	Weber (TX)
Thompson	McLellan	Webster (FL)
Thompson	McLellan	Westerman
Thompson	McLellan	Wied
Thompson	McLellan	Williams (TX)
Thompson	McLellan	Wilson (SC)
Thompson	McLellan	Wittman
Thompson	McLellan	Womack
Thompson	McLellan	Yakym
Thompson	McLellan	Zinke

Crook	Costa	Gray	Titus
DeSaulnier	Crenshaw	Rutherford	Titus
ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	NOT VOTING—5	ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	NOT VOTING—5
Massie	Costa	Gray	Titus
Massie	Crenshaw	Rutherford	Titus
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE	ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	NOT VOTING—5
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.	The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.	ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	NOT VOTING—5
□ 1804	Mr. DONALDS changed his vote from “present” to “aye.”	ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	NOT VOTING—5
So the resolution was agreed to.	The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.	ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	NOT VOTING—5
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.	ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1	NOT VOTING—5

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 5125) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to terminate the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 211, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Gimenez	Miller (OH)
Alford	Goldman (TX)	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Mills
Amodei (NV)	Gooden	Moolenaar
Arrington	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Babin	Graves	Moore (NC)
Bacon	Greene (GA)	Moore (UT)
Baird	Griffith	Murphy
Balderson	Grothman	Nehls
Barr	Guest	Neils
Barrett	Guthrie	Neils
Baumgartner	Hageman	Neils
Bean (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Newhouse
Beginch	Haridopolos	Norman
Bentz	Harrigan	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Harris (MD)	Obernolte
Bice	Harris (NC)	Ogles
Biggs (AZ)	Harshbarger	Onder
Biggs (SC)	Hern (OK)	Owens
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Boebert	Hill (AR)	Patronis
Bost	Hinson	Perry
Brecheen	Houchin	Pfluger
Bresnahan	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Hunt	Rogers (KY)
Burlison	Hurd (CO)	Rouzer
Calvert	Issa	Rouzer
Cammack	Jack	Roy
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rulli
Carter (GA)	James	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Schmidt
Cline	Jordan	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cole	Kean	Sessions
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Shreve
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Crane	Kennedy (UT)	Smith (MO)
Crank	Kigggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Davidson	Kim	Smucker
De La Cruz	Knott	Spartz
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Stauber
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Stefanik
Donalds	LaLota	Steil
Downing	LaMalfa	Steube
Dunn (FL)	Langworthy	Strong
Edwards	Latta	Stutzman
Ellzey	Lawler	Taylor
Emmer	Lee (FL)	Tenney
Estes	Letlow	Thompson (PA)
Evans (CO)	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Ezell	Luna	Timmons
Fallon	Luttrell	Turner (OH)
Fedorachak	Mace	Valadao
Feenstra	Mackenzie	Van Drew
Fine	Fine	Van Duyne
Finstad	Maloy	Van Orden
Fischbach	Mann	Wagner
Fitzgerald	Massie	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McAul	Webster (FL)
Flood	Flood	Westerman
Fong	McClintock	Wied
Foxx	McClintock	Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott	McDowell	Wilson (SC)
Fry	McGuire	Wittman
Fulcher	Messmer	Womack
Garbarino	Meuser	Yakym
Gill (TX)	Miller (IL)	Zinke

NAYS—211

Adams	Boyle (PA)	Cherfilus-McCormick
Aguilar	Brown	Brown
Amo	Brownley	Chu
Ansari	Budzinski	Cisneros
Auchincloss	Bynum	Clark (MA)
Balint	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Barragán	Carson	Cleaver
Beatty	Carter (LA)	Clyburn
Bell	Case	Cohen
Bera	Casten	Conaway
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Correa
Bishop	Castro (TX)	Costa
Bonamici	Craig	Courtney

Craig	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	[Roll No. 275]	Courtney	Keating	Pressley
Crockett	Kennedy (NY)	Ramirez	YEAS—245	Craig	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Crow	Khanna	Randall		Crockett	Kennedy (NY)	Ramirez
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin		Crow	Khanna	Randall
Davids (KS)	Landsman	Riley (NY)	Aderholt	Goodlander	Moore (NC)	Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Rivas	Alford	Gosar	Moore (UT)	Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)	Larson (CT)	Ross	Allen	Gottheimer	Moore (WV)	Landsman
Dean (PA)	Latimer	Ruiz	Amodei (NV)	Graves	Moran	Rivas
DeGette	Lee (NV)	Ryan	Babin	Greene (GA)	Moskowitz	Ross
DeLauro	Lee (PA)	Salinas	Bacon	Griffith	Murphy	DeLauro
DelBene	Leger Fernandez	Sánchez	Baird	Grothman	Nehls	Latimer
Deluzio	Levin	Scanlon	Balderson	Guest	Newhouse	Lee (PA)
DeSaulnier	Liccardo	Schakowsky	Barr	Guthrie	Norman	Sánchez
Dexter	Lieu	Schneider	Barrett	Hageman	Oberholte	Deluzio
Dingell	Lofgren	Scholten	Baumgartner	Hamadeh (AZ)	Dexter	Levin
Doggett	Lynch	Schriner	Bean (FL)	Harder (CA)	Dingell	Liccardo
Elfreth	Magaziner	Scott (VA)	Begich	Haridopolos	Dingell	Schneider
Espobar	Mannion	Scott, David	Bentz	Harrigan	Doggett	Lieu
Espaiat	Matsui	Sewell	Bera	Harris (MD)	Ogles	Scholten
Evans (PA)	McBath	Sherman	Bergman	Harris (NC)	Onder	Scott (VA)
Fields	McBride	Sherill	Bice	Pappas	Elfreth	Scott, David
Figures	McClain Delaney	Simon	Biggs (AZ)	Patronis	Lynch	Sewell
Fletcher	McClellan	Smith (WA)	Biggs (SC)	Perez	Magaziner	Simon
Foster	McCollum	Sorensen	Bilirakis	Fletcher	Matsui	Sherman
Foushee	McDonald Rivet	Soto	Boebert	Higgins (LA)	Perry	McBride
Frankel, Lois	McGarvey	Stansbury	Bost	Hill (AR)	Foster	McClain Delaney
Friedman	McGovern	Stanton	Brecheen	Hinson (AR)	Pfluger	McClellan
Frost	McIver	Stevens	Houchin	Horn (OK)	Pou	Stansbury
Garamendi	Meeks	Strickland	Harder (CA)	Horn (OK)	Frankel, Lois	Stanton
Garcia (CA)	Menendez	Subramanyam	Huizenga	Horn (OK)	Frankel, Lois	Strickland
Garcia (IL)	Meng	Suozzi	Huizenga	Horn (OK)	Friedman	McGovern
Garcia (TX)	Mfume	Swalwell	Hunt	Horn (OK)	McIver	Subramanyam
Gillen	Min	Sykes	Hurd (CO)	Horn (OK)	Frost	Meeks
Golden (ME)	Moore (WI)	Takano	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Garamendi	Swalwell
Goldman (NY)	Morello	Thanedar	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Menendez	Sykes
Gomez	Morrison	Thompson (CA)	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Garcia (CA)	Meng
Gonzalez, V.	Moskowitz	Thompson (MS)	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	García (IL)	Takano
Goodlander	Moulton	Tlaib	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	García (TX)	Thanedar
Gottheimer	Mrvan	Tokuda	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Min	Thompson (CA)
Green, Al (TX)	Mullin	Tonko	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Goldman (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Harder (CA)	Nadler	Torres (CA)	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Moore (WI)	Morello
Hayes	Neal	Torres (NY)	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Gomez	Tlaib
Himes	Neguse	Trahan	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Gonzalez, V.	Morrison
Horsford	Norcross	Tran	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Green, Al (TX)	Tokuda
Houlahan	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Tonko
Hoyer	Olszewski	Crank	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Mrvan
Hoyle (OR)	Omar	Cloud	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Torres (CA)
Huffman	Pallone	Clyde	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Torres (NY)
Ivey	Panetta	DesJarlais	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Trahan
Jackson (IL)	Pappas	Diaz-Balart	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Underwood
Jacobs	Pelosi	Dole	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Vargas
Jayapal	Perez	Waterson	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Veasey
Jeffries	Peters	Schultz	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Ocasio-Cortez
Johnson (GA)	Pettersen	Waters	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Velázquez
Johnson (TX)	Pingree	Watson Coleman	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Wakinshaw
Kamlager-Dove	Pocan	Whitesides	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Wasserman
Kaptur	Pou	Williams (GA)	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Schultz
Keating	Pressley	Wilson (FL)	Rouzer	Horn (OK)	Horn (OK)	Pelosi

NOT VOTING—3

Gray Rutherford Titus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1810

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICING PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is on the passage of the bill (H.R. 5143) to establish standards for law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia to engage in vehicular pursuits of suspects, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 182, not voting 5, as follows:

NAYS—182

Adams	Boyle (PA)	Cherfilus-Cormier
Aguilar	Brown	McCormick
Amo	Brownley	Chu
Ansari	Bynum	Cisneros
Auchincloss	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Balint	Carson	Clarke (NY)
Barragán	Carter (LA)	Cleaver
Beatty	Casar	Clyburn
Bell	Case	Cohen
Beyer	Casten	Conaway
Bishop	Castor (FL)	Correa
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Costa

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 713

Whereas Charlie Kirk was a lifelong advocate for freedom of speech, civil political discourse, and the political engagement of youth;

Whereas Charlie Kirk was a man of deep faith, a husband, and a father to two young children;

Whereas, on September 10, 2025, Charlie Kirk was assassinated on the campus of Utah Valley University while exercising his First Amendment right to freedom of speech;

Whereas, on September 11, 2025, one day after the assassination of Charlie Kirk, Representative Ilhan Omar gave an interview on a Zetee Town Hall with Mehdi Hasan in which she smeared Charlie Kirk and implied he was to blame for his own murder;

Whereas, on September 12, 2025, two days after the assassination of Charlie Kirk, Representative Ilhan Omar reposted a video on X (formerly known as Twitter), which disparaged the character of Charlie Kirk and those mourning his death;

Whereas the video Representative Ilhan Omar reposted on X states “Charlie Kirk is dead, and before the body got cold, the far Right propped his corpse up as a cudgel for their holy war”;

Whereas the video Representative Ilhan Omar reposted on X further states “Don’t be fooled, these people don’t give a single shit about Charlie Kirk, they are just using his death to further their Christofascist agenda”;

Whereas the video Representative Ilhan Omar reposted on X further states Charlie Kirk “was a reprehensible human being. He enacted his political agenda by preying on weak minded people. He took complex socio-economic issues and simplified them by pointing fingers at out-groups, demonizing those groups, and siccing his massive following on them”;

Whereas the video Representative Ilhan Omar reposted on X further states Charlie Kirk was a “stochastic terrorist, an adamant transphobe, he denied the genocide happening in Palestine, he believed in the subjugation of women, and in his last dying words he was spewing racist dog whistles”;

Whereas the video Representative Ilhan Omar reposted on X further states “Charlie Kirk was Dr. Frankenstein and his monster shot him through the neck”;

Whereas the video Representative Ilhan Omar reposted on X further blames Charlie Kirk for his own murder;

Whereas clause 1 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides, “A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House”; and

Whereas Representative Ilhan Omar’s actions in the wake of the assassination of Charlie Kirk are reprehensible and affect the dignity and integrity of the proceedings of the House and do not reflect credibility on the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) Representative Ilhan Omar of Minnesota be censured;

(2) Representative Ilhan Omar forthwith present herself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure;

(3) Representative Ilhan Omar be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and

(4) Representative Ilhan Omar be, and is hereby, removed from the Committee on Education and Workforce and the Committee on the Budget of the House.

□ 1820

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I have a motion at the desk, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Clark of Massachusetts moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 213, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—214

Adams	Gillen	Ocasio-Cortez	Davidson	Jackson (TX)	Obernolte
Aguilar	Golden (ME)	Olszewski	De La Cruz	James	Ogles
Amo	Goldman (NY)	Omar	DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Onder
Ansari	Gomez	Pallone	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Owens
Auchincloss	Gonzalez, V.	Panetta	Donalds	Jordan	Palmer
Balint	Goodlander	Pappas	Downing	Joyce (OH)	Patronis
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Pelosi	Dunn (FL)	Joyce (PA)	Perry
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perez	Edwards	Kean	Pfluger
Bell	Hayes	Peters	Ellzey	Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler
Bera	Himes	Pettersen	Emmer	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Beyer	Horsford	Pingree	Estes	Kennedy (UT)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop	Houlahan	Pocan	Evans (CO)	Kiggans (VA)	Rose
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pou	Ezell	Kiley (CA)	Rouzer
Boyle (PA)	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley	Fallon	Kim	Roy
Brown	Huffman	Quigley	Fedorchak	Knott	Rulli
Brownley	Hurd (CO)	Ramirez	Feeenstra	Kustoff	Salazar
Budzinski	Ivey	Randall	Fine	LaHood	Scalise
Bynum	Jackson (IL)	Raskin	Finstad	LaLota	Schmidt
Carbajal	Jacobs	Riley (NY)	Fischbach	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Carson	Jayapal	Rivas	Fitzgerald	Langworthy	Scott, Austin
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Ross	Fitzpatrick	Latta	Self
Casar	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz	Fleischmann	Lawler	Sessions
Case	Johnson (TX)	Ryan	Fong	Lee (FL)	Shreve
Casten	Kamala-Dove	Salinas	Fox	Letlow	Simpson
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sánchez	Franklin, Scott	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Scanlon	Gill (TX)	Mackenzie	Stauber
Cherifius-	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky	Goldman (TX)	Malliotakis	Stefanik
McCormick	Kennedy (NY)	Schneider	Gonzales, Tony	Maloy	Steil
Chu	Khanna	Scholten	Gooden	Mann	Steube
Cisneros	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier	Gosar	Massie	Strong
Clark (MA)	Landsman	Scott (VA)	Graves	Mast	Stutzman
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David	Hageman	McCauley	Taylor
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Sewell	Hamanah (AZ)	McClain	Tenney
Clyburn	Latimer	Sherman	Haridopolos	McCormick	Thompson (PA)
Cohen	Lee (NV)	Sherrill	Guest	McDowell	Tiffany
Conaway	Lee (PA)	Simon	Guthrie	McGuire	Timmons
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)	Hageman	Messmer	Turner (OH)
Costa	Levin	Sorensen	Hamadeh (AZ)	Meuser	Valadao
Courtney	Liccardo	Soto	Haridopolos	Miller (IL)	Van Drew
Craig	Lieu	Stansbury	Harrigan	Miller (OH)	Van Duyne
Crockett	Lofgren	Stanton	Harris (MD)	Miller (WV)	Van Orden
Crow	Lynch	Stevens	Harris (NC)	Miller-Meeks	Walberg
Cuellar	Magaziner	Strickland	Harshbarger	Moolenaar	Wagner
Davids (KS)	Mannion	Subramanyam	Hern (OK)	Moore (AL)	Weber (TX)
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Suozzi	Higgins (LA)	Moore (NC)	Webster (FL)
Davis (NC)	McBath	Swalwell	Hill (AR)	Moore (UT)	Westerman
Dean (PA)	McBride	Sykes	Hinson	Moore (WV)	Wied
DeGette	McClain Delaney	Takano	Stansbury	Moran	Williams (TX)
DeLauro	McClellan	Thanedar	Houchin	Murphy	Wilson (SC)
DeBene	McClintock	Thompson (CA)	Hudson	Nehls	Wittman
Deluzio	McCollum	Thompson (MS)	Huizenga	Newhouse	Womack
DeSaulnier	McDonald Rivet	Tlaib	Hunt	Issa	Yakym
Dexter	McGarvey	Tokuda	Calvert	Norman	Zinke
Dingell	McGovern	Tonko	Gottheimer	Jack	
Doggett	McIver	Torres (CA)			
Elfreth	Meeks	Torres (NY)			
Escobar	Menendez	Trahan			
Espalliat	Meng	Tran			
Evans (PA)	Mfume	Underwood			
Fields	Mills	Vargas			
Figures	Min	Vasquez			
Fletcher	Moore (WI)	Veasey			
Flood	Morelle	Velázquez			
Foster	Morrison	Vindman			
Foushee	Moskowitz	Walkinshaw			
Frankel, Lois	Moulton	Wasserman			
Friedman	Mrvan	Schultz			
Frost	Mullin	Waters			
Garamendi	Nadler	Watson Coleman			
Garcia (CA)	Neal	Whitesides			
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Williams (GA)			
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)			

NAYS—213

Aderholt	Bentz	Carey
Alford	Bergman	Carter (GA)
Allen	Bice	Carter (TX)
Amodei (NV)	Biggs (AZ)	Ciscomani
Arrington	Biggs (SC)	Cline
Babin	Bilirakis	Cloud
Bacon	Boebert	Clyde
Baird	Bost	Cole
Balderson	Brecheen	Collins
Barr	Bresnahan	Comer
Barrett	Buchanan	Crane
Baumgartner	Burchett	Crank
Bean (FL)	Burlison	Crawford
Begich	Cammack	Crenshaw

Jackson (TX)

James

Johnson (LA)

Johnson (SD)

Donalds

Jordan

Downing

Joyce (OH)

Joyce (PA)

Edwards

Ellzey

Fallon

Fedorchak

Feenstra

Pallone

Panetta

Pappas

Pelosi

Perez

Peters

Pettersen

Pingree

Pocan

Pou

Raskin

Riley (NY)

Franklin, Scott

Gonzales, Tony

Gooden

Ramirez

Randall

Scalise

Scanlon

Schakowsky

Scott (VA)

Scott, David

Sewell

Sherman

Sherrill

Greene (GA)

Smith (WA)

Smith (WV)

Smith (WV)

Stevens

Subramanyam

Torres (NY)

Torres (NY)

Trahan

Tran

Underwood

Mills

Vargas

Vasquez

Veasey

Velázquez

Windham

Walkinshaw

Wasserman

Waters

Watson Coleman

Whitesides

Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Calvert

Gray

Titus

□ 1828

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor and missed Roll Call votes numbered 272 through 276. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 272, ordering the previous question; NO on Roll Call No. 273, agreeing to H. Res. 722; NAY on Roll Call No. 274, final passage of H.R. 5125; NAY on Roll Call No. 275, final passage of H.R. 5143; and YEA on Roll Call No. 276, the motion to table H. Res. 713.

RECOGNIZING CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Constitution Day.

Today, in 1787, our brave Founding Fathers gathered in Pennsylvania to

sign the United States Constitution, one of the most significant documents in history.

For 238 years, this document has laid the groundwork for our Nation's principles and has served as a beacon of freedom worldwide.

Our Constitution guarantees our freedoms, from the right to free speech to the right to practice our faith. The Constitution is a promise that we the people are at the forefront of our government.

Today, the Constitution remains as relevant as ever. As we face new challenges, we must remember that our Constitution has provided us the framework to debate, disagree, and, most importantly, unite.

I am proud to join my colleagues in supporting a resolution recognizing today, September 17, as Constitution Day, highlighting our Nation's beginnings as we approach our 250th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, let us celebrate the principles that make our Nation great on this Constitution Day.

FIRST AMENDMENT IS KEYSTONE OF OUR LIBERTIES

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, four Republicans saved this House from disgrace. We almost passed a resolution to remove a Member from committees for the sin of exercising free speech.

Charlie Kirk was a prominent figure, beloved by many, disliked heartily by others.

If the First Amendment means anything, it means the ability to say anything we want, short of actionable libel, with respect to any subject. It even means, according to the Supreme Court in the Brandenburg decision in 1969, the ability to advocate violence except in a manner calculated to induce immediate violence.

We forgot the First Amendment at our peril. It is the keystone of our liberties, and we almost disgraced ourselves by traducing it a few minutes ago. I am glad we did not.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MIKE VAINI

(Mr. BURLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a dear family friend, Mike Vaini.

Mike was like an uncle to me. He was my father's best friend. He was the best man at my parents' wedding.

For nearly eight decades, Mike was the go-to man for our church, the Springfield First Church of the Nazarene.

In addition to his distinguished 35 years at Kraft Foods, he dedicated himself to his faith, family, and church.

Mike did everything. He served as a Sunday school teacher and a church board member. He even served as the bus driver and, yes, the lawn mower for our church. Mike was simply Mr. Reliable.

When the church needed someone to entertain, he would dress up as Mickey Mouse or Tiny Tim. While his voice probably didn't win any choir competitions, that never stopped him from singing just to light up the room.

Mike loved music. From southern gospel concerts to the great hits of the 1950s and 1960s, he knew all the bands and all the songs.

Mike was a huge sports fanatic. He was a huge fan of the St. Louis Cardinals and the Springfield Cardinals, and he loved playing golf and pinball and watching the Olympics.

I will never forget moments, like going to basketball games with Mike. He would always bring licorice for my brother and me.

Mike and his wife, Linda, were known for hosting parties and bringing people together. He lived 78 amazing years with faith, humor, and generosity. He poured himself into others, especially his family, including Linda.

So many of us thank God for his life. May he rest in peace.

□ 1840

REMEMBERING PORTER MCNEIL

(Mr. SORENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SORENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and a public servant in the Quad Cities, Porter McNeil.

Porter served as a leader in Rock Island County for decades, most recently on our county board, but also as a leader and lover of democratic values.

Porter was an incredible communicator, family man, and friend to all of us. He was in a class all his own. He was a steadfast Democrat, but just this week, a GOP member back home called him "a good man, with class."

Porter loved the Quad Cities and believed in making our home a better place.

In his passing, I am thinking of his wife, Mary, the McNeil family, and his friends. To have so many people remember you so fondly is a testimony of being a great man.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Porter McNeil for being there for us. We will miss him.

RECOGNIZING TRINITY LOVE HOBLIT FOUNDATION

(Mr. BEAN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, did you know that 1 in 50 Americans is living with an unruptured brain aneu-

rysm? It is a silent killer hiding in plain sight. Most won't know it is there until it is too late.

Today, I rise in recognition of Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month and to highlight the lifesaving work of the Trinity Love Hoblit Foundation, based in Fernandina Beach, Florida.

Founded by Olivia and Phil Hoblit in honor of their daughter, pictured here, a vibrant 14-year-old who tragically passed away from a ruptured aneurysm, the foundation is turning grief into action. Their mission is research, training, and treatment for brain aneurysms and strokes, and raising awareness about warning signs.

One of their most important initiatives is the Florida Familial Brain Aneurysm Research Project, a program dedicated to understanding the genetic links and safeguarding future generations.

Mr. Speaker, this month, let us all honor Trinity's legacy by raising awareness and championing early detection because lives truly depend on it.

BILLIONAIRES DON'T PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE OF TAXES

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today Representative BEYER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator WYDEN, and I introduced a billionaires tax bill.

Billionaires don't pay their fair share of taxes, and with the Trump tax program starting in 2017, they have increased their wealth tremendously.

Not paying taxes on real estate and stocks and all that they don't trade or sell, just accumulating that wealth over and over again while hardworking people, firemen, nurses, you name it, pay on their wages is wrong.

We need to have a tax system that collects from people who can afford it, as well. Pope Leo said in an interview recently: "CEOs that 60 years ago might have been making four to six times more than what the workers are receiving," now, it is "600 times more than what average workers are receiving."

To the news that Elon Musk is going to be the first trillionaire in the world, Pope Leo said: "What does that mean, and what is that about? If that is the only thing that has value anymore, then we are in big trouble."

We are in big trouble because that seems to be what is valued all the way to the White House, where they are using cryptocurrency to make money out of their position, and it is wrong.

HONORING HIS ALL-HOLINESS ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH BARTHOLOMEW

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome to America His All-Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew. He is the spiritual head of the second-largest Christian church in the world and leads over a million Greek Orthodox in the U.S. He is here this month to meet with government leaders and to receive the distinguished Templeton Prize.

Throughout His All-Holiness' decades as Ecumenical Patriarch, he has sought to bring together people of all faiths to combat religious intolerance and enhance understanding. He convened an interfaith international conference on Peace and Religious Tolerance in Istanbul. The conference brought together Christians, Jews, and Muslims to find ways to encourage understanding and peaceful coexistence among followers of the three faiths.

The Patriarch has been honored also by the United Nations, the European Union, and dozens of governments, universities, and institutions. In 1997, he was honored with the Congressional Gold Medal.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome His All-Holiness to the United States.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JIM EDGAR

(Ms. BUDZINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the incredible life of former Illinois Governor Jim Edgar.

Governor Edgar was a mentor and a true public servant, but most of all, he was a dear friend.

As a graduate of the University of Illinois' Edgar Fellows Program, I had the privilege of seeing firsthand how Governor Edgar brought people together. He had a rare gift for bridging divides, encouraging voices from all perspectives, and helping us discover common ground on even the most difficult issues.

Governor Edgar led Illinois with integrity, compassion, and an unwavering commitment to the people of our State.

Governor Edgar was a voice of reason, a champion of civility, and an unwavering advocate for collaboration.

In today's era of division and political turmoil, his example of steady leadership and his voice of wisdom will be profoundly missed. His passing is a loss felt across the political spectrum and throughout Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts are with his wonderful family, especially Brenda, Brad, and Elizabeth, along with our entire State, as we mourn his passing and celebrate his extraordinary life.

CELEBRATING CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, today, we celebrate Constitution Day.

Constitution Day is observed on September 17 each year. It was originally passed as a law in 2004 for citizens to remember the founding document, our Constitution, and the hard work they did in Independence Hall back in 1787 to give us the pieces that are really important to our American citizenship.

This law requires educational institutions and Federal agencies to commemorate and teach about it in schools. It is very important that schools emphasize the Constitution, how we got here, and how it is the core of our existence as a free nation.

We have to know about the Constitution as it protects our rights, but it can only do so if we protect the Constitution.

I commemorate each day a person whose rights weren't protected. Iryna Zarutska was a refugee from Ukraine killed needlessly on a train in North Carolina by a guy who had been released 14 times for other crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we could have protected her more. We have a lot to do.

RECOGNIZING JENNIFER DENSON

(Ms. HOYLE of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a member of our community doing incredible work to combat hunger in Eugene: Jennifer Denton.

Since 2015, she has led as executive director of Burrito Brigade, a volunteer-driven nonprofit that has hand-delivered hundreds of thousands of warm, nutritious meals to hungry people across Eugene and Springfield. She also created Free Little Pantries, giving neighbors a way to share food directly with those in need.

During COVID, she launched Waste to Taste, a free, no-questions-asked grocery store that now serves more than a thousand families each month.

Time and time again, Ms. Denton has stepped up to serve our most vulnerable neighbors. Her grassroots work has touched thousands of Oregonians and should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Jennifer for her contributions and am grateful to have her in our community.

□ 1850

SUPPORTING FARMERS

(Mr. MRVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, when the cost of farming rises, it is not just a challenge for our farmers, but it is a challenge to our Nation's security because agriculture is the foundation of America's strength and stability.

During the district work period, I visited the Herr Farm, a fifth-genera-

tion farm, and visited with the northwest Indiana farmers and members of the Indiana Soybean Alliance and Indiana Corn Growers Association.

At that time, they shared with me during harvest time their grave concern for skyrocketing input costs, such as insecticides, fertilizers, and nitrates. These rising costs of goods and services driven by tariffs and the simultaneous loss of export markets caused by those same tariffs are threatening our economic livelihood.

On top of this, challenges with access to workers through the H-2A program leave them uncertain if they can sustain their operations at all. These men and women feed our Nation and power our economy. Yet today many do not know if they will be able to sustain their business for tomorrow.

As we take up fiscal year 2026 appropriations and agriculture legislation, I am committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure all of our farmers get the support they need to continue their essential work.

DEVASTATING HARM CAUSED BY TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today what a privilege it is to join with a dear dozen Members from across the Congressional Labor Caucus and Congressional Steel Caucus to address the devastating harm the Trump administration and DOGE have exacted on people, our communities, the cost of living, and job losses across our Nation.

Job loss and the withholding of funding by the Trump administration of awarded contracts, Federal contracts, withdrawing those from investment across our country, has caused real ruptures in district after district after district. We are going to summarize just some of those tonight.

Today, the Federal Reserve lowered interest rates by a quarter percent. Why did they do that? It was to soften the ongoing damage of an unsteady economy.

From our region of northwest Ohio all the way to Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Louisiana, New Mexico, Maryland, Michigan, Hawaii—the list is long—please listen to the stories of real U.S. companies, workers, and communities that are being devastated by job losses and broken promises. Meanwhile, inflation and prices are steadily on the rise due to the GOP's reckless tariffs.

First, we must ask why the Trump administration is stopping the investment of billions upon billions of dollars in projects that were awarded to make America great again. The answer is the Trump trade war. Well, but then on top of that, this tariff regime is raising prices on everything for American households. The American people are

being squeezed hard every time they try to buy a home, buy a car, afford health insurance, go to the grocery store, or go shopping for clothes, toys, tools, and school supplies. It is a reality that our Nation functions under the weight of unfair global supply chains.

While we can all agree that it is great to manufacture as much as possible in America, that requires real investment in companies and in their workforce. It means building new factories and production capabilities that can compete in the 21st century.

For example, in my district of northwest Ohio alone, the Trump administration just canceled \$107 million in investment for three major projects aimed at modernizing U.S. manufacturing production and distribution. All of those projects were debated and passed last year in both Chambers of Congress under regular order. They were the result of compromise within the Budget and Appropriation Committees, as well as the authorizing committees, and then advanced to the floor for a vote in both the House and the Senate. That is called regular order.

They were signed by the President and awarded—first of all, they were vetted inside these departments and awarded, then, based on merit back in March of 2024. In essence, they were legal, following standard procedure, and were regulated by Federal agencies with receivables awarded and contracts signed.

The recent appointees to the Cabinet agencies, however, reneged on all of these promises. That is not just unfair, it is a breach of legal contract. These breaches of contract for strengthening U.S. manufacturing included \$45.1 million taken from Libbey Glass in Toledo, Ohio; \$16 million taken from Kraft Heinz in Fremont, Ohio; and \$57.3 million taken from Owens-Illinois Glass, which is headquartered in Perrysburg, Ohio, and also operates a facility in Zanesville, Ohio.

These cancellations, these upendings hurt Ohio manufacturing jobs. The Trump administration should reconsider where and who is being harmed. These projects based in our country were part of 24 projects approved by the Department of Energy for a total of \$3.7 billion to modernize and make more efficient facilities across America to combat fierce foreign competitors like China, Mexico, Korea, and others. Make America Great Again means investing in America to improve and modernize here at home.

I have other companies to mention who had the rug pulled out from under them, but I yield now to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BUDZINSKI) from Illinois' 13th District, who is vice chair of the Labor Caucus. I thank her for participating.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KAPTUR for cohosting this Special Order hour alongside me today.

I rise today for my district, for our economy, for our workers, and for our

clean energy future. Last year, my district in central and southern Illinois had investments through the Inflation Reduction Act that would have been transformational.

Take the \$32 million investment awarded to the Kraft Heinz facility in Champaign. This was the single largest award among the 10 sites approved under the Kraft Heinz \$170 million grant from the Department of Energy. These funds would have reduced emissions from this plant by 99 percent. Yet this administration chose to cancel this project, along with countless others, simply because it did not fit their political agenda.

This story isn't unique. Today, you will hear from other Members whose districts received the same frustrating news. It is not just canceling funds to help companies modernize and decarbonize. It is canceling tax credits to help union workers find jobs and to help working people keep the lights on.

The President's so-called big, beautiful bill isn't beautiful. It is a big, ugly joke. The only thing this bill does is hand out tax breaks to billionaires while making it harder for working people to get by.

As we know, the bill canceled tax credits designed to lower people's energy bills, transform our Nation's clean energy economy, and create thousands of good-paying union jobs.

The administration called these investments wasteful spending. I am here to tell you that they are wrong. Good-paying union jobs are not a waste. Building the clean energy infrastructure of tomorrow right here in America is not a waste. Across the country, there were thousands of clean energy projects planned, underway, or just finished that would have benefited from the IRA incentives tied to good labor standards.

To get the full tax credit, these projects needed to meet wage and apprenticeship requirements. This was a huge chance to raise pay and improve job quality for clean energy workers nationwide. Estimates show that without these tax credits, \$522 billion in planned clean energy investments are now at risk. More than \$263 billion of this is wind, solar, and energy storage facilities, while \$110 billion of announced clean energy manufacturing is at risk.

□ 1900

This will have direct implications for Illinois. For our State, eliminating these tax credits means losing 21,000 potential jobs by 2030.

These tax credits are more than just financial incentives. They are lifelines for working families and for working-class communities. Without these tax credits, families' energy bills will go up around \$110 next year and over \$400 per year in the next 5 years.

Yet, this administration has prioritized tax cuts for billionaires over support for everyday Americans, leaving families struggling to make

ends meet in an increasingly difficult economy.

This is not just unfair. It is wrong. If this administration truly cares about working people, now is the time to act. Now is the time to invest in families, create jobs, and invest in a clean energy future.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman and Labor Caucus members for participating this evening and for their tremendous leadership, and I thank them for being with us tonight and telling this story.

Mr. Speaker, when we had the joint session here not so many months ago, I said to the new Vice President, who ran from the State of Ohio as a Senator, then-Senator JD VANCE, now Vice President VANCE, please don't forget Ohio.

The biggest of the cancellations of these investments that was stolen back in Ohio by the Trump administration was another major Ohio company, steel producer Cleveland-Cliffs.

Please let me remind folks that steel helps create America's spine, certainly for manufacturing, and Cliffs traces its roots in our Great Lakes region back to 1847. Get ready for this: Their canceled project amounted to over \$500 million, half a billion dollars, in an industry where China manufactures four times as much as the world uses and then strategically dumps, including in countries like ours, and diverts production in order to get in here through the back door.

Shockingly, Vice President VANCE himself helped cancel this hydrogen-based modern steel project in his own hometown of Middletown, Ohio.

Our Ohio community knows that China produces way too much steel and knows exactly how to wipe out elements of production. Thus, the Vice President's actions make absolutely no sense.

Mr. Speaker, also joining us this evening is Congressman BILL FOSTER, a real leader, including in the scientific community, and he represents, as co-chair, the Research and Development Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KAPTUR and Congresswoman BUDZINSKI for giving us a chance to set the record straight on President Trump's abject failure to restore the strength of U.S. manufacturing, perhaps his number one campaign promise.

I am best known around here as being the Ph.D. physicist in Congress. Before that, I was a manufacturer.

When I was 19 years old, my little brother and I started a company in our basement with \$500 from my parents. That company now manufactures more than half of the theater lighting equipment in the United States. Our company does hardware, software, sheet metal, wiring harnesses, and customer support. We have kept all of those manufacturing jobs in the United

States, and it is something I am very proud of.

I think it is significant also that now, 50 years after we started that company, due to an employee stock ownership plan, it is 100 percent owned by the employees who built the company.

I know how to create jobs, and I know that with what President Trump and his administration are doing, they are not going to deliver. I am, unfortunately, not surprised.

Why is this? I think it is best summarized, actually, by paraphrasing the pithy tweet of Elon Musk when he said, You guys, meaning you guys on Trump's tariff team, haven't built squat, though he was a little more rude in his choice of words.

The point I want to make is that this is not new. The ignorant tariffs that he is applying come from the fact that they simply don't get it with manufacturing because none of them—think about it. There is no one on the Trump tariff team who has ever built anything in their career. They are a bunch of finance people. They are a bunch of real estate dealers.

If you are a real estate dealer, it is a very different kind of job than a manufacturer. If you are a real estate wheeler-dealer, what you want to do is rook your counterparty. You succeed as a real estate wheeler-dealer if your counterparty goes away angry. I tell you what, if you are a manufacturer, the last thing you want is an unhappy customer.

Democrats understand that the real job creators in this economy are customers, and we understand that customers come from the middle class.

For time immemorial, the Republican Party has been about sucking money out of the middle class to provide giant tax cuts for the very wealthy. We can see how that has ended time and again for manufacturing employment in the United States.

Here is the history: Here we have, since before I was born, the history of U.S. manufacturing employment, depending on which party held the Presidency. You can see the huge job increase when FDR—that was when we were coming out of the Depression, which is understandable. It continued through President Truman. Then, it went down when the Republican Dwight Eisenhower took over. Then, it went up strongly under President Kennedy, down under President Nixon, up in Carter's administration, down in Reagan's administration, and down again in Bush the elder's administration. It went up during the Clinton administration and down strongly during George Bush's administration. That was, frankly, because of the historic mistake that was made by both parties to let China into the World Trade Organization without having an understanding that they should obey the requirements of good membership in the WTO and not manipulate their cur-

rencias. That is not what President Bush was about.

Then, it went up, of course, during President Obama, down during the first Trump Presidency, and up during the Biden Presidency. Now, of course, it is trending downward again in the Trump Presidency, so this is not a surprise. This is something that is really, I think, easy to understand because of the basic philosophy of the Republican Party.

This is just the data in a bar graph, just the same thing.

In Presidency after Presidency, when the middle class is strong, demand is strong, and manufacturing is strong. Manufacturing employment follows.

This is not rocket science. This is simple, basic economics. A strong middle class yields strong manufacturing growth and strong manufacturing employment. It is a lesson that we have had to learn again and again in the history of our country, and I hope we remember that history and don't forget it in the future.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman for participating and for that excellent information that we will share across both Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN), a Steel Caucus vice chair and a Labor Caucus member from the great State of Indiana in the industrial north.

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. KAPTUR for bringing us together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in great urgency to voice the concerns of hardworking families in Indiana's First Congressional District.

Communities across northwest Indiana are feeling the economic hardship and uncertainty brought on by this administration's policies.

I was proud to support the bipartisan infrastructure law, which awarded \$1 billion for a clean hydrogen hub that would create thousands of jobs in northwest Indiana. BP's oil refinery prepared to make a private investment of over \$6 billion. Members of organized labor created apprenticeship programs to ensure we had the workforce to bring this project to fruition, but the so-called big, beautiful bill terminated the clean hydrogen production tax credit, causing BP to put the project on indefinite pause for reasons related to economic uncertainty.

These policies are conscious decisions to create confusion, hesitation, and uncertainty, not just in hydrogen production, but also the challenges for our auto industry to grow and for the outsourcing of American steel production and our national security to the highest foreign bidder.

□ 1910

Mr. Speaker, the loss of American manufacturing jobs is a direct result of the administration's failed economic policies that harm hardworking families in my district.

Just today, I met with the equipment manufacturers from Indiana. They

make essential products in the construction, automotive, energy, and agricultural industries. Rising costs on inputs, market uncertainty, and disruption in supply chains are harming these businesses and putting millions of good-paying jobs at risk.

When costs for these businesses rise, so does the cost of living for the families across the country. I believe that targeted tariffs such as section 232 is not only a national security issue but boosts domestic manufacturing. Many steel workers in the steel industry in my district rely on our ability to combat unfair trade practices from China and elsewhere that flood our markets with heavily subsidized and cheaply made products.

Mr. Speaker, we must have a more surgical and sector-based approach toward our trade policies; or we will continue to see job loss in the manufacturing sector, rising costs at the grocery store, and long-lasting impacts on our economy.

I will continue to work across the aisle to find middle ground to make sure we support our working families and that we lower the costs to live in northwest Indiana, in Indiana, and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to create domestic manufacturing that creates jobs so those individuals can have a healthcare policy and so those individuals can have an economy that grows and works for them. Again, I thank Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR for leading us today.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MRVAN.

I have traveled over to Indiana many, many times. When I first ran for office, it was part of the Congressional Steel Caucus and remained one. I saw the U.S. steel industry crushed, and I have spent my entire career trying to help rebuild it in America. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to serve with Representative MRVAN because I know he shares that same commitment. I thank him for coming down to the floor tonight.

After Mr. TONKO's presentation, I will turn to Representative VAL HOYLE from Oregon's Fourth District. She is also a vice chair of the Congressional Labor Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the Representative from upstate New York and also a member of the Congressional Labor Caucus.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KAPTUR for leading us in this evening's discussion. I offer heartfelt thanks for the drive she provides for economic development and, perhaps more importantly, economic recovery. I thank her for her intellect.

Mr. Speaker, in New York's capital region, we know the value of hard work and the dignity that comes with a paycheck, a steady paycheck. I think that is driven somewhat, perhaps greatly, by the DNA of our Nation, which is the pioneer spirit. People are just about innovation. They want to discover and create a stronger economy.

It is also inspired in upstate New York because I represent the eastern-most portion of the Erie Canal. This is a bold vision that connected a great ocean, the Atlantic, with the Great Lakes. It allowed for not only the strengthening of the port of a small place called New York—New York City—but gave birth to a necklace of communities dubbed “mill towns” that became the epicenter of invention and innovation. They not only inspired a westward movement but addressed favorably the quality of life of people across the great world.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is a part of history and now underpins the opportunity to grow an innovation economy. Yet, under the Trump administration, working people are being betrayed. Reckless tariffs and political maneuvers have created chaos for manufacturers, for farmers, for scientists, and union workers alike.

We saw the promise of good-paying jobs in offshore wind manufacturing at our ports. Yet, instead of stability, this administration issued stop-work orders and launched sham investigations that have chilled the industry.

Some manufacturing projects are pressing forward; but others have been forced to walk away, robbing our region of jobs, stalling clean energy deployment, and denying New Yorkers the growth that they were promised. This loss is not confined to New York’s 20th, my congressional district.

Across the Nation, 142 clean energy projects have already been threatened, delayed, or canceled. This puts at risk nearly \$87 billion worth of investment and more than 91,000 good-paying jobs.

The same story is unfolding in research and innovation. For decades, Federal funding has fueled jobs, discovery, and partnerships amongst universities, business, industry, and manufacturing. Cuts are now forcing campuses to lay off researchers and driving businesses to look elsewhere for stability.

With world-class universities, a surge of semiconductor investment, and transformative projects like the EUV accelerator at New York CREATES, the capital region is at the cutting-edge of the innovation economy.

When Federal support for these institutions and industries is threatened, it doesn’t just hurt today’s jobs. It jeopardizes tomorrow’s breakthroughs, our competitiveness, and the livelihoods of the next generation.

This is about whether America leads in clean energy, advanced manufacturing, quantum computing and semiconductors, or cedes those opportunities to competitors abroad. We are supposed to win all the races and make us great again. We are falling behind in competition.

Construction workers, researchers, manufacturers, and students are ready to build the next generation of American industry. Instead of investing in them, this administration is pulling the rug out from under them. This is

not just bad policy. It is a cruel betrayal of working people.

We owe it to our workers, our communities, and the future of American innovation to end these destructive policies and commit to building it all. Let’s take our history to remind us that we are at our greatest when we embrace and reach to the pioneer spirit in all of us.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman TONKO for his time. He is such a leader. He doesn’t have to be here this evening, but I know how hard he works on his committee and on his subcommittees. I know how grateful the people of New York are to have his service here.

I thank him for helping to trace the history of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, which connects his part of America, all the way west to Duluth, Minnesota. It takes us to the Atlantic and to the world. I thank him so very much for being here tonight, and it is an honor to serve with him.

Mr. Speaker, before I call on Congresswoman HOYLE, I thank her for coming. I am reminded, as I was listening to Congressman TONKO, there is a plaque way up practically at the top of the ceiling here. We have to have really good eyes to see it.

For those who can’t be with us in the Chamber tonight, let me remind them of the quote of Daniel Webster, one of the Founders of our Republic, who called on us to: “Let us develop the resources of our land, draw forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and ask whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.”

That is why we are here tonight. Each of us is working in our regions to perform something worthy to be remembered. It is quite painful when the President of the United States and his minions inside the administration take away something that was legally passed, signed, juried, awarded, and then taken back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE), who represents Oregon’s Fourth Congressional District and is the vice chair of the Congressional Labor Caucus. Coast to coast, New York to Oregon, I thank her for joining us.

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KAPTUR for yielding time.

Across the central and south coast of Oregon, where I represent, we have seen the real consequences of the Trump administration’s reckless tariff policies. These aren’t just bad economic choices. They have created ripple effects that hurt working families up and down the supply chains.

Mr. Speaker, 99.4 percent of businesses in Oregon are small businesses. These are small businesses and manufacturers who utilize parts from all over the world.

Rising costs due to the erratic tariff policy of this administration are in-

creasing their costs, which means that they have to increase their costs to consumers. That means that we are losing market share here and abroad.

We also have our world-class winegrowers, and they are facing fallout from the tariffs against some of our closest allies such as Canada, which alone makes up nearly half of Oregon wine’s export market. Overnight, those sales went away.

The impact doesn’t stop at the vineyard gate. It hurts the farmhands tending the fields, the bottlers, the distributors, the small retailers, and the restaurants that proudly serve Oregon wine.

□ 1920

Some of our manufacturers are also closing up shop and moving offshore to avoid the tariff uncertainty, so the pain spreads to our machinists and our welders and also to the parts makers, the shippers, and the communities counting on those paychecks. That is because people in my District earn their money by the hour, not off of stock dividends.

The through line is clear. These policies have created uncertainty at every level of our economy. They don’t just take away jobs. They destabilize the entire supply chain and the communities behind it.

Oregon workers and businesses deserve better. They deserve policies that strengthen industries instead of pulling the rug out from under them. They deserve to know that Congress is standing with the workers to keep our communities running.

Today is the day that we remember the Constitution. The Constitution has directed that Congress should be the ones determining tariffs. It is Congress. The majority has handed away our constitutionally given duty to an administration that is now hurting jobs in my district and across this country.

I am proud to stand with the Congressional Labor Caucus tonight to make sure their voices are heard and to fight for an economy where every worker, from the mill floor to the vineyard to the factory line, has the security and the respect that they have earned.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman so much for participating and for her focus on tariffs and how devastating those have been.

In our part of the country we call ourselves the Great Lakes nation, and we work with Canada in almost a seamless economy. We are the third largest economy in the world.

These tariffs are wreaking havoc every time parts cross the border. Just in automotive, for example, a part can cross the border seven times from Ohio to Ontario, Canada, and back again and back again and into Michigan, so we really are being harmed deeply every day by these tariffs.

I wanted to just place on the record a few extra details of the plight of Libbey Glass in Toledo, Ohio, in my

hometown. I mentioned that \$45.1 million was canceled by the Department of Energy to Libbey Glass, and it was part of \$6 billion in funding through the Department of Energy for industrial decarbonization.

This is where America lost so much ground, as Congressman FOSTER talked about, to China. We are trying to rebuild the muscle of America. The company was going to retrofit its plant with a new electric furnace technology to reduce CO₂ emissions significantly. The award aimed to add to the capacity of the plant that still operates in its original facility and creates living-wage jobs in the heart of Toledo, Ohio. They call Toledo the Glass City. It is our identity, but now that opportunity has been quashed unnecessarily, so carelessly and thoughtlessly.

Instead of new, modern furnaces that could have lasted more than a decade, the plant will be forced to invest in less efficient and environmentally unfriendly furnaces that will last for 2 to 3 years only.

Because the Trump administration has cut the funding for 2025, the firm will be forced to spend even more in 2028, 2031, 2034, and 2037. You get the picture, Mr. Speaker. It is backwards math that just doesn't add up. It means America becomes less competitive in manufacturing. That does not make America great again.

Please, please, Trump administration, pay attention to the details. I don't think the President would want this outcome. I think there must have been a blip somewhere in the bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the Fourth District of Maryland (Mr. IVEY).

Representative GLENN IVEY is a distinguished judge, as well as a very great intellect, and I am very grateful for his participation this evening.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for hosting this Special Order today and for the great work that she has done on behalf of the State of Ohio and for the Nation. We serve on the Appropriations Committee together, and I have had a chance to see her do outstanding work on a firsthand basis, so I want to thank her for her service.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of hardworking public servants who were using their expertise and training for scientific advancement that could save lives and preserve American leadership in technology and innovation. Unfortunately, the Trump administration forced them out of their jobs and out of their laboratories.

I had a chance to meet with many of these individuals over the last few months. We had a job fair in my district not that long ago, and a couple of people came through had a chance to chat with me. Unfortunately, we didn't have anything that met the caliber of the background and expertise that they possessed.

One was a Ph.D. researcher at NIH who had been doing clinical trials on

Alzheimer's research. She told me that what had happened was she had been laid off. Everybody in her lab had been laid off. So what that meant was the trial that they had been running for years got shut down.

As we all know with clinical trials, Alzheimer's, cancer, and others—and I will come back to those—these aren't light switches, Mr. Speaker. We can't just flip the switch and start it back. In some of those instances, we have to start from scratch.

Alzheimer's is a disease that I have a special interest in. It killed my father. I watched him waste away from Alzheimer's, and I now pay closer attention to the impact that that disease can have and the way it ravages thousands of people every year across the country. Instead of doing the research to find a cure for Alzheimer's, their laboratory got shut down.

Medical devices was another one. I met a gentleman who was a mechanical engineer. He had been trained and earned his Ph.D. in research. He worked for the Federal Government. I believe he was at the FDA, if I recall correctly. He did tests to make sure that the medical devices that were up for approval had been tested and actually worked the way that they did.

He gave me an example. He said that pacemakers were one of those. There are people who are trying to make innovations with respect to these kinds of medical devices. The job at his office was to make sure that these worked the right way and were safe and efficacious. His lab got shut down.

I met another individual. She had a master's in public health. She got fired. You won't imagine how ironic it was, Mr. Speaker. She got fired, and she was doing work on measles. Just at the time they had the major outbreak in Texas, she was laid off, and her group was canceled out as well.

The New York Times, just last weekend I believe it was, published a cover story on their magazine about losing the war on cancer. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the United States has been one of the leading innovators with respect to research, and cancer has been a huge focus on that research. We have been doing outstanding work there and making huge strides forward.

As I mentioned a moment ago, I am a cancer survivor, and I was a beneficiary of the fact that we had innovations that changed the way that treatment was provided just in time for when I came along. That was 20 years ago. However, now we are shutting those clinical trials down, and that article lays it out clearly and sadly.

It was a little ironic. Mr. Speaker. You may recall that here in this Chamber, President Trump gave a speech. It looked kind of like a state of the Union, but it wasn't actually that address, but there was a young boy up in the seats over there who was a cancer survivor. He had him stand up. He gave him a badge from, I think it was, Secret Service and celebrated his sur-

vival. Just a few days later, the Trump administration terminated research for pediatric cancer.

We have to find a way to make sure we don't lose the competition with China. I just mentioned medical issues there, but the Trump administration is doing so many things with respect to research and development and high tech.

China, on the other hand, as we heard from one of my colleagues a moment ago, is pushing employees. They are developing them. They can't develop them fast enough, and they are pushing them into research and work with respect to artificial intelligence and quantum computing, while here in the United States, especially in the last 9 months, we are doing everything we can—well, the Trump administration is doing everything it can, it would seem, to limit the number of people who can go into this kind of work. They are cutting back on the grants that would allow people to do the research, and they are cutting the funding for people who are going to school to earn their Ph.D.s to pay for their education.

□ 1930

China is doing the exact opposite. To the extent the United States has been behind on creating its own researchers and developers here in the United States, we have had a lot of people come from overseas, people who are doing outstanding work, but they come from other countries. Then the Trump administration decided it wanted to cancel their visas.

Some of the attacks on Harvard, in particular, the big threat was: We are not going to let you have international students come to study. The result of that was, international students from all around the world who are the top of the line, doing outstanding work, this is the next generation we want to help and have them come. Many of them come to the United States from other places, and they like it here so much they stay. They build their careers.

In fact, many of the research and innovation entities that we have in the United States are run by people who have come from overseas, immigrants who have come to the United States. But we are forcing them away, scaring them away, and pushing them to other countries.

You have got to believe the other countries are welcoming them with open arms. I was just talking to a group who trains doctors, medical doctors. They said the people that we train here, they are being pulled away to other countries now because they can complete their medical training, go work overseas, the medical training gets covered, and so they can get their medical education done and then go to work and have a chance to be successful and provide the type of medical care and treatment that we want to have here in the United States, but we are losing that, as well.

We have got to make sure that we do everything we can to preserve the institutions and the departments and

agencies that are doing great work here in the United States. NASA, NOAA, FDA, and NIST are all doing great work. The universities we have got here are doing great work on the R&D front. That is the only way we are going to be able to win the competition with China. That includes AI, quantum computing, and high-tech. Those are the places that gave us the lead that we have in software and in the computer industry. GPS and LASIK were spinoffs of R&D that was worked on at NASA. Instead of building that up, the Trump administration is laying people off.

Mr. Speaker, 445,000 Federal employees lost their collective bargaining rights. As the Senate report pointed out, in forcing out tens of thousands of people who worked for the government—many of them doing the science and tech work that I just talked about—the Democratic staff report calls it: The \$21 billion blunder, analyzing the waste generated by DOGE.

DOGE didn't focus only on science and tech, but its impact has been resonating there for sure in a very damaging way for the United States.

We need to work together to force the Trump administration to see the error of its ways. We need to make sure that we get back on track so that we can win the competition with China, preserve our leadership role in the world, and build on the great advances that we have had here in the United States.

Let's get to work.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman IVEY. We sure are glad that cancer research resulted in extending his life for these many decades because we sure need him here in Congress. His constituents have really elected a great man here. I thank him so much for being here tonight and working with us to bring these issues before the American people.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHMIDT). The gentlewoman from Ohio has 17 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY), who is an active member of the Labor Caucus.

I will say to anyone who is listening to us here this evening, these Members have worked all day. They started very early this morning. You can say they are doing a double shift, in my part of the country. They haven't eaten dinner. I just want the American people to know that there are Members of Congress who work very hard, who respect our Constitution, and who respect the laws of this country. It is now almost nearly 8 o'clock in Washington, D.C., moving on that, and they are here to represent you.

Congresswoman STANSBURY is amazing, and I thank her for joining us.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, it is like the changing of the seasons. There is a consistent pattern across our econ-

omy year after year. Democrats rescue and build an economy that empowers workers, that invests in American-made jobs, that invests in our infrastructure and our people just as we did in passing the largest bills in generations over the last several Congresses: the bipartisan infrastructure bill, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act, which not only invested millions of dollars in communities all across the United States but created countless jobs and opportunities for our people.

Just like that, a President like the current President comes in, just as he has done twice, and drives up the deficit, borrows against our children's futures, and takes American taxpayer dollars to give billionaires permanent tax credits. Unemployment rises, families fall behind, and the damage is done. Then we are called upon to pick up the pieces once again, put people back to work, and restore stability to our economy.

If you are wondering what season we are in now, all you have to do is take a look at the headlines: "Grocery inflation highest since 2022 as Trump tariffs pile on." Or this one: "Poorer Americans hit hardest as tariffs fuel price rises."

Mr. Speaker, it is a cold winter for families across America under Trump's America, under his failing economic plan, and tariffs that are not even legal and which this House of Representatives, under the GOP, voted yesterday on a rule with language to abrogate their constitutional authority to rein him in. I watched them flip the votes on the floor as they gave away our constitutional authority to hurt American workers.

Long-term unemployment is reaching heights we haven't even seen since the beginning of the pandemic. Grocery prices are more expensive than they have ever been. Inflation is forcing Americans to live on credit cards. Housing is so expensive that young people can't even move into their own homes. People can't access the most basic healthcare in this country right now. That is Trump's economy.

As we take stock of where this economy stands today, I think it is pretty damn clear why Donald Trump went bankrupt six times. He is literally bankrupting this country and the hard-working people that are its backbone. The livelihoods of our communities are on the line, not poker chips in one of his Atlantic City casinos.

These are farmers, ranchers, working people, families whose lives hang in the balance.

In New Mexico, our farmers are being crushed under the weight of these tariffs, losing export markets, watching the USDA programs, that once purchased homegrown, healthy foods to put into our schools and food banks, dry up.

Here is another headline: "Farmageddon. Many U.S. farmers are warning that they are at a breaking

point," a breaking point, just like our families, farmers who depend on reliable markets.

When the President imposes tariffs on our allies, depending on which way the wind is blowing on any given day, he forces hardworking people in this country into financial ruin.

The result is only the largest corporations and the rich get richer, driving the prices up, driving small farmers out, consolidating our food system, and pushing the American Dream, just basic dignity, further out of reach for our people.

For me, this is personal, Mr. Speaker, because I grew up in a working family where people in my family worked multiple jobs and still struggled to get by, where we didn't have access to healthcare, where we didn't always have access to reliable housing.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, this is personal. In New Mexico, there are thousands of families who are struggling just to make it to the end of the month.

I will say that, despite the darkness, New Mexico is leading the way and showing what it looks like to lead with integrity and invest in an economy that will make it possible for families to thrive.

In fact, in just a couple of weeks, on October 1, our State legislature will convene in the wake of Republicans' disastrous big, ugly bill, which will gut healthcare and food assistance programs, to actually shore up the programs that will save and support thousands of lives in our State. They will invest in food and healthcare programs and fix the public broadcasting funding that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle blew a hole through when the majority passed the rescissions package.

Perhaps the most consequential legislation and policies that New Mexico has announced in the last several weeks are that we are now officially the first State in the Nation ever in the history of this country to guarantee universal free childcare. That is going to put over \$12,500 back into the pockets of every working family in New Mexico.

That is real money. That is money for putting a roof over your head. That is money for putting food on the table. That is money to go back to school. That is what it looks like when you invest in working families.

In addition to that, New Mexico is the only State in the Nation that guarantees free college. Whether you want to go to trade school or get a higher education degree in graduate school, in New Mexico, you are going to do it without debt because we understand that the future of our country, economy, and communities depends on investing in people, not taking away the vital programs that support them.

Every day, I am working on behalf of our communities to invest in early childhood education, entrepreneurial

programs, bringing millions of dollars home for infrastructure, youth programs, healthcare, behavioral health, and clinics back in New Mexico because we know that that is how you deliver for real working people.

Mr. Speaker, the seasons may change, but we know this cycle is going to go on. Families in New Mexico and across the Nation are going to continue to pay the price for your billion-dollar tax breaks.

Americans literally cannot afford this economy. They can't afford this administration or the GOP's leadership here in this House.

That is why we are here to speak up, speak out, fight back, and stop the damaging programs that are eviscerating our economy and harming our communities. We know the season will change, and we know we will come back and invest in hardworking American families. Until then, we call upon our States, Tribal, and local leaders to do what they can. They should know that we are here in the fight for real Americans.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) for that impassioned plea, and I stand with the gentlewoman.

Coming from New Mexico, with everything happening there with the climate and so forth, the gentlewoman really is such an excellent Representative. I thank her for joining us as a member of the Labor Caucus. The gentlewoman gave just a fantastic delivery.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANNION), a Labor Caucus member from the 22nd District. I thank the gentleman for waiting this evening. It is now 7:45 p.m., and the gentleman is still on the job.

Mr. MANNION. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KAPTUR for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as the final speaker tonight, let me take you to upstate New York, Syracuse, central New York, the Mohawk Valley, just west down the Erie Canal from my good friend, Representative TONKO, who represents the capital region.

This is a place where I have lived and loved my entire life. These are communities that know firsthand what happens when Washington breaks its promises and when jobs and investments disappear.

We remember back home when Griffiss Air Force Base closed. We remember when Carrier left. Those were our sheet metal workers. We remember when New Venture Gear and a Chrysler plant closed. Those were our UAW brothers and sisters. There were others that have left our region behind.

It is through that prism that we see the Trump administration's \$30 million clawback of Federal funding awarded to Syracuse, New York. This was funding for a project that had bipartisan support and passed in a Republican-majority House. It is a piece of one of the

largest infrastructure projects in the Nation and the largest in the history of upstate New York. That is the reimaging of Interstate 81.

That money was meant to build roads and sidewalks, reconnect utilities, and restore opportunity where an elevated highway divided a community of color in the early 1960s.

Pulling those funds away is a betrayal of the working families who were promised progress and, instead, are left with fewer jobs, less opportunity, and delayed urban renewal. It is uncertainty that has existed over the last 9 months, and that uncertainty is part of a great American city that I have lived in for my entire life.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the only bad policy that is hurting the region and the people I represent. Our economy is tied deeply to Canada. In fact, New York's 22nd District, which doesn't even border Canada, exports \$1 billion in goods and \$227 million in services to Canada each year.

This is a longstanding trade relationship that supports more than 6,400 jobs locally and directly employs 1,400 people at Canadian-owned businesses. Slap-shot tariff policy and volatile trade policy have put those jobs at risk.

Our manufacturers who rely on metals, equipment, and machinery are watching the costs rise. Just yesterday, in a hearing in the Agriculture Committee that I serve on, farmers were talking about their increased costs. Those increased costs are often related to automated farm machinery that they can get only from outside of the United States.

They don't have time to wait and see if, possibly, domestic manufacturing will occur. They need help now.

As my colleague stated before, it is under our purview as Congress. Article I, Section 8, gives us the authority for imposts and excises, not the executive office.

Our manufacturers rely on those things. Our farmers, especially our dairy and specialty crop producers, are losing access to stable export markets. Our small businesses, like local breweries that depend on Canadian aluminum for cans, are feeling the pinch.

When tariffs slam the border, it hits the bottom line for small businesses in Syracuse, Utica, Auburn, Cortland, and other communities across my district.

While we are fighting those challenges, the Trump administration is also attacking renewables, a fast-growing private-sector employer in New York State. That is not just in my district. In Representative STEFANIK's district, a hydrogen fuel cell plant was not going to be completed by the same company that was going to build in California and Texas.

It is not about a red State or a blue State. It is about the demand that we have for energy as we move into the future.

As my colleagues also stated, we are falling behind. Canada is beating us. It

is time to invest. We need more energy. Without that energy, we are going to continue to fall behind.

What jobs were lost in that project for hydrogen fuel cells not even in my district? In Massena, New York, jobs like the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, IUPAT, and others do not have those jobs that were promised. They pulled the plug because those hydrogen fuel tax credits were pulled.

We are fighting that challenge. The cuts, the loss of these jobs, and the loss of promises and tax credits are impacting our ability to hit our clean energy goals and lower our utility bills for consumers. It is making it harder to attract investment and job-creating opportunities in my district and around the upstate region.

We have fought for clean energy manufacturing. I did so in the State senate as the cosponsor of a piece of legislation called Green CHIPS, which has brought Micron Technology into my district, producing semiconductor chips using clean energy. I was the co-prime sponsor of that legislation. This is the largest private investment in the history of this country.

That is where we are: broken promises on I-81; reckless tariff policy that destabilizes trade for the agricultural sector, manufacturing sector, and small businesses; and shortsighted cuts to energy programs, which will make power generation more challenging and cost jobs and investment while driving up energy costs.

□ 1950

I can tell you this: New York-22 communities are resilient. We have rebuilt before, and we are building again. We are building with Micron and others, with investments in advanced manufacturing, with world-class dairy farmers and growers who continue to feed the Nation, and with workers who never stop fighting for a better future.

Washington should be our partner in that progress, not a roadblock. I will never stop fighting for my hometown and the working people of this country. I will always keep telling the truth to my constituents and the American people.

It is bad policy that is hurting our country, leaving us behind, and costing Americans more. The people I serve deserve nothing less than a Congress that works together and does the work that they have been constitutionally given the right to do.

No one should cede our House of Representatives' constitutional power to Donald Trump. We can fix this. We can put our country over politics and workers over partisanship. That is the way forward, and that is what I will be working on to deliver for the people of central New York, along with my Congressional Labor Caucus partners.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MANNION for his passion

and for his obvious dedication throughout his life to restore the economic might of his district. I know that struggle. Our Federal Government has been too slow to respond to the wash-out of jobs and capacity across this country, and that is what is making our politics so rocky.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your generous gavel this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD some materials that we were not able to verbally enter this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I will invite Secretary of Energy Wright, President Trump, and Vice President VANCE to come and stand with the workers at Libbey Glass in Ohio so they completely understand what it takes to rebuild manufacturing in America. I hope they will show up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHARLIE KIRK

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. MOORE of Utah was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I will use my time to take a brief moment and reflect on the horrific assassination of Charlie Kirk and the importance of free speech in America.

It is not lost on me that I am standing here on the House floor, as my colleagues and I do every session day, sharing my opinions and thoughts about the state of our country and what Congress is doing about it.

It is a special place where we get to link arms with our fellow delegation or caucus members and talk about causes that matter to us, debate back and forth with our friends on the other side of the aisle, welcome the President and foreign dignitaries to speak, and so much more. This place represents open debate and discussion, and Charlie did, too.

As we all process the tragedy that took place just a week ago, I hope we remember the ways he engaged with those who didn't agree with him. That is what makes the American experiment work, from classrooms to workplaces to kitchen tables to the Halls of Congress. Charlie modeled fearlessness in having the conversation and opening the door to debate, and I hope we all can, as well.

My sincerest condolences go out to the Kirk family as they navigate this unimaginable grief. As a society, I hope we can carry forward Charlie's legacy of free speech and commitment to faith.

I also will share my heartfelt gratitude to Utah Governor Spencer Cox for leading with integrity during this difficult time for our State and our country. There is no better person to be in a position of leadership and navigate this than him, and he surely has made Utah proud on the national stage.

He encouraged all of us to disagree better, and while the suspect chose not to heed that counsel, the rest of us can.

Lastly, I will also thank Utah law enforcement, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, and all of our State and Federal partners who worked around the clock to identify the suspect. Your sacrifice is always appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTREME HEAT CAUCUS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. STANTON of Arizona was recognized for 30 minutes.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Arizona has suffered year after year after year of record-breaking temperatures. Our summers are getting hotter, lasting longer, and providing little relief at night. This heat is incredibly dangerous for our health and for our economy.

Last summer, tragically, more than 600 of our fellow Arizonans lost their lives to the heat. Today, there are another 406 heat-related deaths in Maricopa County, Arizona, parts of which I have represented for 25 years. Those deaths are under investigation. We are on track, yet again, to be one of the deadliest areas for heat exposure in this country.

That is why I launched the bipartisan Extreme Heat Caucus early this year with Congressman MIKE LAWLER of New York. At one point this summer, nearly half of the country's population was under an extreme heat warning. From coast to coast, we are struggling to keep people safe and to fully understand the challenges posed by extreme heat.

Extreme heat is a danger to public health, but it also threatens our very way of life. As heat waves get worse, roadways will crack, energy grids will falter, and crops will dry out. Insurance rates and electric bills will spike.

Some Arizonans saw triple-digit increases on their electric bills this summer. More evictions will follow. Front-line workers will stay home or end up hospitalized. Our local economies will lose millions.

We have to take this seriously, but this administration has shown a pro-

found disregard for the problem at hand. From his very first day, President Trump has gutted the Federal heat response. Researchers, public health experts, and administrators of critical grant programs were caught up in Trump's mass firings, and it is everyday Americans who will pay the price. A senior, struggling to balance a tight budget, could be left high and dry without LIHEAP funds to cover their electric bills or keep the AC running. A single mother, working full time is worried that her child's school won't be able to keep him safe during recess or after-school sports practice. A landscaper, growing his small business, was diagnosed with kidney disease in his early 30s due to heat exposures.

Members of the Extreme Heat Caucus and I are fighting for the Federal workforce that handles extreme heat to be reinstated. Their work is critical to combat extreme heat and the greater climate crisis.

Without a robust Federal heat response, we put countless lives and billions of dollars at risk. The Extreme Heat Caucus is stepping up to change that. We are championing smart, bipartisan actions to combat extreme heat.

As a former mayor of Phoenix, I have been focused on heat policy that starts local, where the rubber meets the road. Our cities, counties, and universities are pioneering new ways to combat extreme heat and to respond to heat emergencies, but they are often going at it without proper and adequate funding.

My bipartisan bill, the Heat Management Assistance Grant Program Act, will allow States, local governments, and our Tribal partners to apply for dedicated, fast-release funding to respond to extreme heat events. This funding could be used to stand up cooling centers, purchase medical equipment for heat illnesses, or many other critical services.

For families worried about balancing high-energy costs with high grocery bills, I have been working to introduce the LIHEAP Parity Act. The bill will fairly and fully distribute LIHEAP dollars to families in cold weather States who need help with their heating bill in the winter and families in warm weather States like mine who need help with their air-conditioning bill in the summer.

We still don't know much about the possible impacts of extreme heat on our emergency response, so as the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure's Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Subcommittee, I partnered with Congresswoman DINA TITUS on the Extreme Weather and Heat Response Modernization Act, which, among many other things, will study the unexpected impacts of heat on key infrastructure and public health.

That study was wrapped into a larger FEMA reform package, and it passed our committee on a huge bipartisan

margin. It will form an emergency response advisory panel to study slow moving natural disasters like extreme heat.

□ 2000

I am glad to see the study one step closer to law, and I will keep working to get the Extreme Weather and Heat Response Modernization Act across the finish line, as well.

I thank my colleagues who have come to speak before the House today. They understand the challenge before us.

As Members of Congress, our most basic duty as elected officials is to keep our constituents and fellow Americans safe. Right now, Congress must rise to the challenge and start actively combating the effects of heat.

All of us here agree on this duty before us. Now we have the responsibility to meet this moment and to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure now to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my friend, and the ranking member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, this summer, Americans from coast to coast are enduring the hottest temperatures in recorded history. Days are not just uncomfortable, they are life-threatening for millions of workers across the country.

From agricultural workers in the fields, to warehouse employees, to construction crews and factory staff, many are laboring in extreme heat with no Federal protection from one of the oldest, most serious, most common workplace hazards, and that is, of course, heat stress.

The science is clear, the medical evidence is overwhelming, and the moral case is undeniable. Yet, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, still lacks a national standard to protect workers from dangerous heat exposure on the job.

In addition to the important legislation mentioned by the gentleman from Arizona to address the issue, I am a proud cosponsor of the bill introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) to prevent senseless deaths of workers due to heat. The bill honors the memory of a farm worker who tragically died after working 10 straight hours in 105 degree heat without access to shade, water, or a break. His death was preventable, as are the deaths of so many others happening every year.

We have known for a long time that it does not have to be this way. In the fourth century BC, Alexander the Great was counseled to guard against heat stress as his troops marched through the desert. Heat stress is even documented several times in the Old Testament. Our own military adopted a heat stress prevention program in 1952, and I remember when I was in basic training in the Army, when the heat

reached certain temperatures, we would have to loosen the bottom of our pants and stop doing physical training, or PT. The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, advised OSHA on the need to protect workers from heat stress back in 1972, and again in 1986, and yet again in 2016.

Workers have waited long enough. Thanks to Representative CHU's leadership, we have reintroduced a bill that will end delays and excuses and finally bring workers the commonsense protection they deserve. Within one year, OSHA would be required under the bill to finally issue an enforceable rule setting out the strongest feasible protections against heat illness. It empowers OSHA to require rest breaks, access to water, shaded or cool recovery areas, and training that delivers information in a language and format that workers can certainly understand. These are simple and sensible safeguards that will save lives.

As the climate crisis accelerates, workers are increasingly at risk. Heat stress is a predictable problem, but it is also a preventable problem. The urgency of the crisis requires us to act now, and this legislation is the roadmap for that action. Workers' lives depend on it.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for forming the Extreme Heat Caucus and for organizing this Special Order to give us the opportunity to emphasize the importance of this issue.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT for his leadership on this important issue and the bill that he referenced supporting our workforce dealing with extreme heat. That is an important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that is all of our speeches on this important topic of the extreme heat and the Extreme Heat Caucus. I yield back the balance of my time.

BREAKDOWN OF TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I will talk one more time about what I think is the most pressing problem facing America as we try to address the crime rate, the drug problem, and the education problem. It is a problem that was, sadly, not addressed in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act.

As a matter of fact, the One Big Beautiful Bill Act went, to a certain extent, in the opposite direction. I want to educate the American public on this problem, and that is the breakdown of the traditional family with a man in the household over the last 60 years of America.

As this Congress tries to make America great again, it is hard to imagine America being that great if we continue to punish and penalize any family that has both parents at home.

America has changed dramatically. In the 1960s, about 5 percent of the children in this country were born into families without both a mother and father at home. I want to point out, I know families of all sorts of backgrounds. I know parents who have done a fantastic job of raising children in all backgrounds, and sometimes beyond their fault, there are families who appear to be doing a perfect job of raising their children, but nevertheless have a problem.

I think most Americans, though, with common sense would say it is more difficult for, say, the post-1995 generations, where 40 percent of American children are born without a mother and father at home, compared to the generation of children born in the 1960s, when that number was only 5 percent.

We have to ask ourselves why that happened. Sometimes when I talk to people back home, they mention the decline in religion, and maybe that is why we shot up from 5 percent to 40 percent.

Actually, if you look at programs the government authors, and I am going to reference George Gilder a little bit here, who was a great sociologist, if I can call him that, who wrote "Wealth and Poverty" in 1980. He looked at single-parent families to see if he had any observations. The families he looked at were specifically from the poorer parts of Albany, New York. At the time a woman got pregnant, if the family was not a married group, they began to collect benefits, and it was not a panic situation in which, how are we going to support the child? What are we going to do? Are we going to have to live with your parents? What are we going to do? It was kind of gleeful as they went from government office to government office getting their low-income housing, getting their free healthcare, getting their free college education if they wanted to go to college, food stamps, like I said, free apartment, which I think is the most generous giveaway of all.

Now, I don't know that it is good that we have created a situation in which a young person getting pregnant should be happy because of all the government benefits they are eligible for, but if you look at the eligibility requirements for every one of these programs, they are based on what we call percent of poverty. If you have somebody in the household—it could be a woman or it could be a man—if a man is in the household, you could penalize that family by easily \$25,000 or \$30,000 cash for having both parents at home.

An example of programs which fit the bill, which we penalize people for getting married, would be formerly called food stamps, certainly low-income housing, which by itself can be a benefit of over \$12,000 a year; something called the earned income tax credit, which can easily be \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, provided you work and keep your income under \$17,000 or \$16,000 a year.

□ 2010

If you do a little bit of work, unlike, say, if you had a sister who is married to a husband with a salary, you would get free childcare, childcare not available to a couple with two incomes.

There is a TANF program for people who aren't employed, giving free cash away. Again, it is much easier to get if you don't have a working parent in the household.

We have our child credit, which is, again, something that is phased out and appears to be designed to discourage people from getting married.

We have Pell grants—and I will tell you a story about that in a minute—a program that gives free college to a family without a working person.

Not surprising, if you spend some time talking to people who aren't at your country club fundraiser, spend some time talking to people who are not lobbyists, you will be surprised how many young people today are not getting married because they want that \$25,000, \$30,000 cash benefit that you get if you stay single and frequently don't have a man in the house.

I will also point out that frequently these benefits allow you to get benefits better than people who are working are getting. For example, it is a well-known thing, but if you talk to people, clerks at the local food store will tell you that people on food stamps are frequently buying things that the clerk in the food store cannot afford.

When it comes to low-income housing, particularly because we have a horrible program called the low-income housing tax credit program, the government incentivizes developers to build housing that costs \$300,000, \$400,000, or, in some cases, over a million dollars per unit, in which some people will be able to live, provided their income is low enough. You will find out what a person working for me once found out.

She got married, and she and her new husband were looking for a new apartment. They found what they felt were the nicest apartments in Madison, Wisconsin, were the low-income apartments. Not only do you get a free apartment, but it is superior to the apartments that other people are paying for.

With regard to childcare, I have heard a childcare provider say that she preferred to get the vouchers—and I don't know if this is always true; I have heard a mixed bag—but get vouchers from somebody from the government because those were always paid.

Childcare is very expensive today. If you agree to take care of a child, maybe sometimes that family will not have enough income to pay for the child. If you are on the government dole, it is more consistent. You will always get the childcare credit.

With regard to college, I will tell you a story. I once gave this speech about 15 years ago in Green Bay, Wisconsin, and I wondered what the people would

think of the marriage penalty. Most of the people who were listening to the speech were older people. It was a Tea Party group, and they, of course, all agreed with me that it was scandalous that we were bribing somebody \$25,000 a year not to get married.

I asked a gal who was present in the room that night—her job was a bartender—what she thought about these programs in which you would get a benefit, not only if you didn't get married, but an even larger benefit if you didn't work too hard. She said she got married before she had a baby, but a lot of her friends preferred not to get married before they had a baby because they got free college. In other words, one more time we had a situation in which this woman—and I found there were other people in the same boat making the same observation.

Young people going to college—kind of hard to believe, but it is true—may decide not to get married because they get the Pell grant, another poorly designed program, and get it to pay for either all or part of their college.

You may say: Is this all on purpose? Did the government design these programs to destroy the American family? Who would do that?

Let's not forget that Karl Marx, a socialist who is looked up to in some universities, said one of his goals was to abolish the family.

More recently, in 1960, a woman who has been described as the mother of women's studies—which is a major we make fun of in college. Nevertheless, it is something that a lot of kids take as an elective. Kate Millett, the mother of these classes, said: The complete destruction of the traditional marriage and the nuclear family is the utopian goal of feminism.

I have a feeling a lot of people don't realize that the utopian goal of feminism was to get rid of the nuclear family. Obviously, Kate Millett's successors are probably thrilled that we penalize married couples \$25,000, \$30,000 for getting married.

More recently, a Wisconsin Supreme Court judge—this is just what we call dictum. Nevertheless, she was a judge elected statewide. She said the notion that marriage serves as the foundation of the family is at best outdated and at worst misogynistic.

This is a woman who didn't, obviously, put that on her television commercials. It is interesting that a very liberal judge in the State of Wisconsin clearly had contempt for traditional marriage. Apparently, she maybe took some women's studies classes in college.

It seemed from her comments in this court case that she would be thrilled if traditional marriage was no longer the norm.

I talked to an Indian immigrant back home in my district. He made an interesting observation. Congressmen should go out of their way to talk to their immigrants because, frequently, they have observations as to what is

going on in America that Americans who have been here their whole lives do not have. What he said is that, in America, the woman marries the government, and that is exactly true.

When we have a country in which the woman is encouraged to marry the government, the woman, the child, and the father pay a price. Children born in a difficult background like this are, by almost every standard, on average—and I realize there are examples of tremendous parents—on average, have a tougher go of it in life. They are going to struggle more in school. They are going to be more likely to use drugs. They are going to be more likely to commit crimes.

It is kind of interesting when I sit in committee hearings around here. We had a committee hearing on crime earlier this week. People look around for the causes, or this or that, of the problems we have, problems related to drug abuse, problems related to crime, maybe problems related to depression. They never talk about what the real problem is, the real problem being the breakdown of the family.

Does anybody doubt that if we still had a rate of fatherlessness in the home of—or a rate of intact families—back to 5 percent as we did in the 1960s, that our crime rate would drop like a stone? Does anybody think or not think that the number of—even though it can happen in the best of families—the number of people dying of drug abuse wouldn't fall? Does anybody think our education would improve if we had kids who are doing a better job of focusing at school?

It is high time, in the second bill that this Congress passes, that we begin to address this problem. We can't address it by giving every married couple \$25,000 a year because we don't have that kind of money and would probably only encourage more people not to work very hard.

□ 2020

Mr. Speaker, by the way, I should mention, just as these programs discourage marriage, they all discourage work. I will mention the low-income housing tax credit program.

Mr. Speaker, I ran into somebody a couple of months ago. In order to be eligible for these very nice apartments, they could make only so much money. I will speculate that this person was making, say, \$50,000 a year. If they got a second job, they had to be aware that their rent would go up.

In this country, particularly with the low-income housing tax credit, we penalize people who work hard. I think that is horrible public policy, but that is what we do.

Mr. Speaker, in any event, when the next reconciliation package comes through, I strongly hope that the Republican leadership, rather than allowing something like the low-income housing tax credit to go through and be expanded, of all things, Republican leadership recognizes this is a problem.

Even if they don't care if a man is in the house or not, at least they shouldn't penalize him. They shouldn't hate families in which a man and woman are raising their children together. I think that should be the number one priority of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the second issue that I will take on is that we passed a defense authorization bill last week that I think had a serious problem. I would hope our slumbering press corps would do a little bit more work on the problem.

Elon Musk and DOGE were here. They did a good job pointing out that there were some, particularly in offices, Federal employees in the District of Columbia, or even around the country, that maybe weren't working that hard. Some of this happens in the private sector. More likely, it will happen in the public sector.

Right now, we have about 80,000 employees—I think a little bit under that; it might be 76,000—in the Department of Defense who are non-uniformed. I assume most of these employees are not people who cut the lawn or something. Most of these employees are in an office, and at least Elon Musk seemed to point out that a lot of them might not be working that hard.

Under the defense authorization, they anticipate, over the next year, the number of non-uniformed employees will drop by maybe another 30,000 or 40,000. When DOGE was riding high, I think one would have expected this number to drop more like 200,000 or 300,000.

I then asked the Department of Defense to, as quickly as possible, put together a proposal and say what would happen if they had to make do with only 400,000 or 450,000 non-uniformed employees in the Department of Defense. I will point out that a lot of these employees are making over \$100,000 or \$150,000 a year, with anecdotal evidence that they do very little.

One of the reasons Congress is so irresponsible is our press corps is asleep. I hope our press corps digs into this situation a little bit and publicizes how many people are working in desk jobs in the Pentagon, desk jobs in which they are not in uniform, and questions whether this is really necessary. We can then see whether there are significant savings here.

Of course, some of the money will not go to reducing our debt. Insofar as we find excess people around here, I think we are not prepared enough in this country for hypersonic missiles. I don't think we have an Iron Dome-type Israel situation in which we are prepared for other sorts of missiles.

I think the reason we are not prepared is that there are way too many people who are not working as hard as they could in the Pentagon. I am going to ask the press corps to wake up and ask people about that.

I will also ask the press corps to wake up and ask Congress whether it is appropriate that we penalize married

couples by \$25,000 or \$35,000 a year because they got married, as opposed to their siblings who may not have gotten married.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I want to comment on tonight. I was listening to a television program on one of the big conservative networks, and I listened to a commentator make fun of socialism. She talked about how much better capitalism was. I don't think she has a good handle on why capitalism is good.

First of all, we ought to require all defenders of capitalism to not call capitalism "capitalism." We ought to call it a free-market economy. The major reason we would rather live in a country with a free-market economy than in a country that is a socialist economy is the government has so much more power in a socialist country than a free-market economy.

In a socialist economy, or as we work toward a more socialist economy, a larger segment of the population works for the government. As an elected official, I have noticed in my time that, frequently, people who work for the government are afraid to speak openly to me about problems in their field.

Mr. Speaker, I am thinking a substitute teacher would be afraid to give me a campaign contribution because they worked for a school district that was hostile to Republicans. They felt they would be discriminated against if they knew they gave money to a Republican politician.

There are people who worked for the Department of Natural Resources in Wisconsin, which is the equivalent of the EPA in Washington, who tell me about problems in their department but caution me that they could never cite them. What they were telling me had to be secret because they worked for the government and because they were afraid the government would discriminate against somebody who backed the party, the less government party, the Republican Party.

In a free-market economy, we can rent from whoever we want. In a socialist state, all the property is owned by the government. Right now, my office is in a place called Fond du Lac, Wisconsin. If I want to live in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, first of all, I pay rent. I am guessing that in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, there are maybe 400 different landlords. The landlords compete for the rental dollar.

I have the ability to buy my own house, paint my house whatever color I want, and maintain my lawn in whatever fashion I want. That is something we do in a free-market economy.

In a socialist economy, the government runs everything. If I want to rent a dwelling, I have to rent from the government. If the government doesn't like me, if I have said the wrong thing, or if I have said something that is politically incorrect, they may say they will not rent to me. They might also give me an inferior place.

The same thing applies to food. In a free-market economy, my guess is, in

Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, a city of only about 35,000 people, I bet there are 150 places where I can go to eat and have something made for me.

In a socialist economy, something that the gentleman who is running for mayor of New York would like—I guess he would like only one type of grocery store. There would only be one sort of restaurant because all the restaurants are run by the government.

First of all, since they are owned by the government, they don't have to compete into a better job because they are never going to go through bankruptcy. Secondly, because they are owned by the government, the government determines what fare is offered. They determine how many restaurants we have that will serve Italian fare or Mexican or what have you. It is much better in a free economy.

Even more importantly, in a socialist economy, we have to work for the government. The more people who have to work for the government, the less freedom they have. If we have to work for the government and the government is all-powerful, as it is in a socialist state, the government determines whether we keep our jobs, whether we are promoted in our jobs, or whether or not we get raises.

Mr. Speaker, it is all determined by a government that may look down on us if we are critical of the central planning authority. That is a big difference between a free-market economy and a socialist economy.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, in a socialist economy, you do not have to do well because you are owned by the government, or if you have a restaurant that has crummy food or you have a factory in which the people are not working very hard, because apparently some people are not working very hard for the Department of Defense, you do not get in trouble for that.

Because it is a socialist economy, everybody becomes poorer because there is no incentive to work that much harder. You can't lose your job, Mr. Speaker, because everybody is working for the government. That is another reason why life is so much better in a free market economy.

I think people like being free better. When you talk about testimonials in the old Soviet Union, Mr. Speaker, and probably to this day because the work ethic hasn't changed enough, you run into a lot of very unhappy people because they are stuck in an economic system in which they have to work for the government.

As a matter of fact, I know a friend who went to Cuba. It was an interesting observation. In Cuba, which is an island country, he noticed that there were no, or almost no, boats on the docks as he went around the Gulf of Mexico.

This is a sign of what happens in a socialist state. People are so unhappy there that they won't allow them to

get on boats and go into the Gulf of Mexico to somewhere else. They have got to force the people to stay at home.

In any event, I think in the future when we explain to the younger people why we like a free market economy rather than a socialist economy, we should emphasize the freedom that comes with a free market economy, the freedom to pick one of hundreds of employers in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, or if you want to get around the whole country, one of hundreds of thousands of employers. You have the ability to rent or buy a home wherever you want, Mr. Speaker, not where you are restricted by where the government is. You have the ability when you go to a retail outlet to have people competing for your sales dollar so there are a lot of opportunities to buy this item of clothing or these appliances or whatnot, as opposed to in a socialist state where the government determines what the government bureaucrats think you need.

Finally, of course, you are overwhelmingly wealthier because in a free market economy, Mr. Speaker, you are free to work hard, and you are free to open up your own business. By doing that, all of society is wealthier, as opposed to the socialist state in which everybody has to work for the government. There is no guaranteed incentive for working harder. If you think of a better way to do business, Mr. Speaker, you are not allowed to set up business on your own. All you can do is make a suggestion to your boss, and if he doesn't care to take your suggestion on how the business can improve, well, Mr. Speaker, then it just never improves.

This is why the socialist state in old Russia, the old Soviet Union, was so ineffective.

In any event, to summarize tonight, first of all, I really hope Republican leadership and President Trump begin to address the \$25,000 penalty this country imposes on any married couple with children.

Secondly, I hope Republicans point out when they talk about the difference between socialism and what they refer to as capitalism, that the major difference is the freedom that comes from a free market economy.

Finally, I hope the press corps pays attention to the huge number of non-uniformed employees in the Department of Defense and what the current administration is doing about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 18, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1949. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Marketplace Integrity and Affordability [CMS-9884-F] (RIN: 0938-AV61) received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1950. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Administrative Simplification: Modifications of Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), National Council for Prescription Drug Programs (NCPDP) Retail Pharmacy Standards; and Modification of the Medicaid Pharmacy Subrogation Standard; Updates to Compliance and Other Related Dates [CMS-0056-IFR] (RIN: 0938-AU19) received August 22, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1951. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification of intent to remove certain items and services from the United States Munitions List (USML), pursuant to section 38(f)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1952. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds [FAC 2025-06, FAR Case 2024-001; Docket No.: 2024-0001; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AO73) received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1953. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2024 Federal Coordinated Health Care Office-Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1315b(e); Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2602(e); (124 Stat. 315); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GUTHRIE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4273. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user fee program for over-the-counter monograph drugs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3157. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to add a standard related to the evaluation of State intermittent energy policies, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3616. A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review regulations that may affect the reliable operation of the bulk-power system, with an amendment (Rept. 119-302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KEAN:

H.R. 5419. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a plan for ensuring timely review of communications use authorizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5420. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain authorities and requirements relating to health care and benefits furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 5421. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of William Lacy Clay Sr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP (for himself and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia):

H.R. 5422. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the semi-annual report on privatized military housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 5423. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the use of predatory commercial motor vehicle lease-purchase programs by certain motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 5424. A bill to support communities that host transmission lines and to promote conservation and recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 5425. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the feasibility and advisability of establishing a uniform policy to provide tuition assistance after one year of active duty service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5426. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAUR, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. CLARKE

of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SIMON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. RAMIREZ):

H.R. 5427. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate tax loopholes that allow billionaires to defer tax indefinitely through planning strategies such as “buy, borrow, die”, to modify over 30 tax provisions so that billionaires are required to pay taxes annually, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5428. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to award grants to accredited public institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ (for herself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 5429. A bill to require the Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture, and Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on improving collaboration in housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 5430. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize the funds under the matching grant program for school security to be used to hire school resource officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 5431. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to pay reparations issued by international bodies or courts for a violations of international law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:

H.R. 5432. A bill to require the Comptroller General to conduct a comprehensive study of the operations of LUMA Energy and Genera PR in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HOYLE of Oregon (for herself, Mr. RYAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.R. 5433. A bill to prohibit health insurance issuers and certain health care providers under Medicare from being under common ownership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 5434. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to dedicate sufficient resources for the support of LGBTQ+ youth seeking help from the 9-8-8 suicide prevention hotline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. LANDSMAN, and Ms. Ross):

H.R. 5435. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for congenital Cytomegalovirus screening of newborns; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANNION (for himself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 5436. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit an educational institution from withholding a transcript from an individual who pursued a course or program of education at such institution using Post-9/11 educational assistance; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself and Mr. BIGGS of Arizona):

H.R. 5437. A bill to prohibit civil actions brought against a manufacturer or seller of a stone slab product for harm resulting from the alteration of such a product by a fabricator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMICK (for himself, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. CLINE):

H.R. 5438. A bill to incentivize Federal agencies to create savings for the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5439. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Medically Tailored Home-Delivered Meals Program to test a payment and service delivery model under part A of Medicare to improve clinical health outcomes and reduce the rate of readmissions of certain individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. MACKENZIE, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. FOUSHÉE, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. LAWLER):

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for small businesses to provide diaper changing stations in restrooms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 5441. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the advanced manufacturing production credit to include fusion energy components; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 5442. A bill to build on America’s spirit of service to nurture, promote, and expand a culture of service to secure the Nation’s future, address critical needs of the Nation, and strengthen the civic fabric of American society; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Natural Resources, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Veterans’ Affairs, Homeland Security, Intelligence (Permanent Select), House Administration, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms.

BONAMICI, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. McGARVEY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. THANEDAR):

H.R. 5443. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on

source of income, veteran status, or military status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROSS (for herself and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia):

H.R. 5444. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to address the shortage of medical laboratory personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHOLTEN (for herself, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, and Mrs. MCIVER):

H.R. 5445. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize Federal-State clean water program development and implementation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 5446. A bill to limit the authority to impose duties on articles of food; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG (for himself, Mr. FONG, and Mr. WHITESIDES):

H.R. 5447. A bill to amend chapter 511 of title 51, United States Code, to modify the authority for space transportation infrastructure modernization grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JOHNSTON of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. FIELDS, Ms. BROWN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AMO, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. CROW, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SALINAS, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, and Ms. GOODLANDER):

H.J. Res. 122. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections and to enact public financing systems for political campaigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SYKES:

H.J. Res. 123. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Marketplace Integrity and Affordability”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ADERHOLT (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. STRONG, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. RULLI, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MILLS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JACK, Mr.

THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. KING-HINDS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SCHMIDT, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. BACON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. PALMER, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mrs. BICE, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. COSTA:

H. Res. 729. A resolution expressing support for and honoring September 17, 2025, as "Constitution Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. Res. 730. A resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J.Res.4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that debate upon legislation pending before the Senate may not be brought to a close without the concurrence of a minimum of three-fifths of the Senators; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. Res. 731. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 155) to require States to permit unaffiliated voters to vote in primary elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 732. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 30, 2025, as "Rare Cancer Day" to highlight the challenges patients with rare cancers face and to raise awareness and support efforts to improve early diagnosis and treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. RANDALL):

H. Res. 733. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of September 20 through September 27, 2025, as "National Estuaries Week"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution:

By Mr. KEAN:

H.R. 5419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 5421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BISHOP:

H.R. 5422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const., article I, Sec. 8, cl. 1, 12, 14, 16, 18

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 5423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 5424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 5425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5

Article I, Section 8

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 5428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ:

H.R. 5429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 5430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 5431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:

H.R. 5432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. HOYLE of Oregon:

H.R. 5433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H.R. 5434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 7

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 5435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MANNION:

H.R. 5436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 5437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MCCORMICK:

H.R. 5438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 5439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 5440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 5441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 5442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. ROSS:

H.R. 5444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

By Ms. SCHOLTEN:

H.R. 5445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 5446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STRONG:

H.R. 5447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, Section 8, Article 1

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.J. Res. 122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, Section 8

By Mrs. SYKES:

H.J. Res. 123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. WALKINSHAW.

H.R. 51: Ms. POU and Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 116: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 134: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 138: Mr. VINDMAN.

H.R. 219: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 378: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 485: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 507: Mr. LIEU and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 516: Mr. HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 909: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.

H.R. 924: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 925: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 979: Mr. PALMER, Ms. FEDORCHAK, and Mr. WALKINSHAW.

H.R. 1004: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
 H.R. 1046: Mr. MORAN and Mr. BRECHEEN.
 H.R. 1055: Ms. BYNUM.
 H.R. 1061: Ms. CRAIG, Ms. SIMON, and Mr. DELUZIO.
 H.R. 1065: Mr. IVEY.
 H.R. 1236: Mr. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 1241: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 1262: Mr. AMO.
 H.R. 1269: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHMIDT, and Mr. WALKINSHAW.
 H.R. 1299: Mr. KEAN and Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 1307: Mr. IVEY.
 H.R. 1340: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
 H.R. 1357: Mr. STRONG.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 1422: Mr. SMUCKER.
 H.R. 1566: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine and Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
 H.R. 1585: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
 H.R. 1651: Mr. ESTES.
 H.R. 1661: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 1672: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1685: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 1708: Mr. BACON and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1723: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1732: Ms. PEREZ and Mr. MENENDEZ.
 H.R. 1761: Mr. MCGUIRE.
 H.R. 1772: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 1793: Mr. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 1842: Mr. BRESNAHAN.
 H.R. 1918: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
 H.R. 1965: Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 1966: Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H.R. 1970: Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Ms. BALINT, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. VINDMAN, and Ms. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 1993: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2013: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 2028: Mr. OWENS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 2048: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. BUDZINSKI.
 H.R. 2103: Mr. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 2172: Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 2189: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SCHOLTON, and Mr. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 2220: Ms. DEXTER.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 2366: Ms. CRAIG.
 H.R. 2485: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2547: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 2548: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. KENNEDY of New York.
 H.R. 2550: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
 H.R. 2605: Mr. STRONG.
 H.R. 2692: Mr. LANDSMAN.
 H.R. 2717: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 2760: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 2853: Mr. HUNT, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H.R. 2878: Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 2948: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
 H.R. 3028: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
 H.R. 3030: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 3105: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
 H.R. 3127: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
 H.R. 3131: Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 3139: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3184: Ms. FRIEDMAN and Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
 H.R. 3218: Ms. CRAIG.
 H.R. 3277: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. IVEY, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 3365: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 3420: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 3483: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.
 H.R. 3495: Mr. MESSMER, Ms. SCHOLTON, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 3514: Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 3565: Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3591: Mrs. FEDORCHAK.
 H.R. 3592: Mr. GUEST.
 H.R. 3597: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
 H.R. 3632: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
 H.R. 3683: Mr. LIEU.
 H.R. 3699: Mr. GUEST and Mr. FRY.
 H.R. 3933: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 4008: Mr. STAUBER.
 H.R. 4044: Mr. HURD of Colorado.
 H.R. 4074: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 4145: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 4176: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 4182: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 4197: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4202: Ms. SCHOLTON.
 H.R. 4206: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 4288: Mr. LALOATA.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 4318: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 4392: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 4467: Mr. EZELL.
 H.R. 4474: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 4582: Mr. IVEY and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 4583: Mr. IVEY and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 4624: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHMIDT, and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 4662: Mr. TRAN and Mr. MIN.
 H.R. 4667: Mrs. TORRES of California.
 H.R. 4669: Ms. GILLEN.
 H.R. 4704: Ms. LEE of Nevada and Mr. LALOATA.
 H.R. 4768: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
 H.R. 4776: Mr. EVANS of Colorado and Ms. PEREZ.
 H.R. 4782: Mr. BISHOP.
 H.R. 4788: Mr. RULLI, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
 H.R. 4849: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4935: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 4936: Mr. MAGAZINER.
 H.R. 4966: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 4972: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 4995: Mr. HUIZENGA.
 H.R. 4996: Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 4998: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.
 H.R. 5004: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 5052: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 5081: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 5106: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H.R. 5135: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 5140: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 5142: Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BACON, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 5150: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.

H.R. 5195: Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 5200: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 5201: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 5206: Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5221: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. BICE, Mr. VINDMAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 5237: Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 5238: Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 5271: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 5282: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 5284: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5316: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 5334: Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 5343: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 5346: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 5361: Mr. CASAR.
 H.R. 5369: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. MAGAZINER.
 H.R. 5392: Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.
 H.R. 5393: Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.
 H.R. 5401: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 5411: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.J. Res. 12: Mr. OWENS.
 H.J. Res. 54: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.J. Res. 80: Mr. SOTO and Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.J. Res. 108: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
 H.J. Res. 111: Mr. CARSON.
 H. Con. Res. 27: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
 H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. GOSAR.
 H. Res. 64: Mr. RASKIN.
 H. Res. 317: Mrs. HAYES.
 H. Res. 501: Ms. PEREZ and Ms. KING-HINDS.
 H. Res. 694: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H. Res. 697: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM and Mr. FIGURES.
 H. Res. 704: Ms. DELBENE.
 H. Res. 715: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H. Res. 716: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H. Res. 719: Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, Mr. TIFFANY, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Ms. LEE of Florida, and Mr. KILEY of California.
 H. Res. 720: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H. Res. 723: Mr. TRAN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ARRINGTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 5371, the Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2026, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.